

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

# The Classical Review

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W.M.V.  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher  
BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A.

K. J. MAIDMENT, M.A.

F. H. SANDBACH, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)

PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A.

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)

N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society

With the co-operation of

Representing the Council of the  
Classical Association

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and  
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, University of Toronto

Volume LXIII

MAY 1949

Number 1

## CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	1
A RECONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE AXES IN ODYSSEY XXI. W. B. STANFORD	3
THREE NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES, WASPS. M. PLATNAUER	6
TWO NOTES ON HORACE. D. A. KIDD	7
A NOTE ON ATHENIAN IMPERIALISM. R. MEIGGS	9
THE DATE OF PETRONIUS. R. BROWNING	12
LONG-TERM COMMANDS AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC. J. P. V. D. BALSDON	14

### REVIEWS:

*Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides* (Zürcher), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 15; *Thucydide et l'impérialisme athénien* (de Romilly), A. W. GOMME, 16; *Sokrates* (Gigon), J. TATE, 18; *Knowledge and the Good in Plato's Republic* (Joseph), D. J. ALLAN, 19; *Aristotle* (Jaeger), G. R. G. MURE, 21; *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus* (Bos), P. B. DUFFIN, 22; *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Éphante, Diotégène et Sténidas* (Delatte), M. P. CHARLESWORTH, 22; *Philo* (Wolfson), H. CHADWICK, 24; *Some Oxford Papyri* (Wegener), *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris servatis* (Paap), H. I. BELL, 25; *Vergil's Latium* (Tilley), M. L. CLARK, 26; *La questione petroniana* (Marmorale), R. BROWNING, 28; *Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique* (de Saint-Denis), D'A. W. THOMPSON, 29; *Theramenes en zijn Tijd* (van der Ploeg), M. CARY, 30; *Festschrift für Édouard Tièche*, J. TATE, 31; *Antike und Abendland*, II. J. L. MYRES, 32.

SHORT REVIEWS	33
CORRESPONDENCE	37
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	37
BOOKS RECEIVED	38

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 5s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$3.40. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$6.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition £3. 15s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 6s., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

### HEFFER'S of CAMBRIDGE

#### for CLASSICAL BOOKS

##### *New & Secondhand*

It is still not possible to issue catalogues as frequently as we would wish, but your inquiries will receive intelligent and prompt attention, in short, the usual Heffer service

##### **Buyers of Fine, Rare, and Scholarly Books**

Particularly wanted are Loeb Library, Dictionaries, Cambridge Ancient History

*The Bookshop known the world over*

**W. HEFFER & SONS  
LIMITED**

PETTY CURY

**CAMBRIDGE**

#### **TERTULLIAN'S TREATISE AGAINST PRAXEAS**

By E. EVANS 21s.

This is an edition of the Latin Text fully annotated, with a new translation appended. It is designed for students, and should be a valuable contribution to the resources of scholarship.

**S.P.C.K.**

**Northumberland Avenue  
London, W.C. 2**

tain  
nion  
ion;  
call  
overs

mual  
mual  
*k in*  
and  
crip-  
tion  
r an

J. S.  
er of  
rsity  
Hon.  
ning-  
don,  
ford,  
and

T

.  
n  
a  
t  
d  
-  
f

16

T

AFT  
tion  
*Clas*  
vol  
whi  
sche  
mee  
nee  
the  
Com  
tise  
and  
of r  
hav  
and  
ser  
spe  
gra  
to  
A v  
of  
not  
ter  
Ac  
Ass  
Wo  
the  
nes  
tha  
to  
Ge  
sti  
tio  
cra  
Do  
giv  
del  
en  
vo  
an  
dif  
mi  
us

xi  
ex  
ou



# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

MAY 1949

## NOTES AND NEWS

AFTER some fifteen years of preparation and inevitable delay the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* has appeared, a volume of nearly a thousand pages in which more than a hundred and fifty scholars are harnessed to the task of meeting for this British generation the need which was first (and last) met by the dictionaries of Sir William Smith. Compression has been severely practised—too severely, some may think, and the omission of persons and places of minor or minimal importance might have allowed other articles to be longer and correspondingly more useful; the services of experts have sometimes been spent on purely factual pieces of biography which hardly needed an expert to compose them in their present form. A welcome innovation is the inclusion of many 'omnibus' articles which deal not with individual places, persons, or terms but with subjects, ranging from Acrostics, Agriculture, Arbitration, and Assonance to Time-Reckoning, War, Women, and Zoology; almost all of these would have gained much in usefulness by expansion, and one may wish that more space might have been given to them, even if Bostra and Tanusius Geminus had to disappear, or, better still, that they might have had a dictionary to themselves in which Democracy had not to compete for room with Dositheus Magister. But, on the terms given, the question of balance was a delicate one; the editors had the unenviable assignment of producing one volume to fulfil a variety of purposes, and one must sympathize with their difficulties and accept their compromises. May the work be gratefully used—and kept in print.

An article in *Overseas Education* (vol. xix, No. 5, October 1948) records an experiment in classical teaching carried out in Palestine during the last few

years of British administration. On the initiative of the Director of Education, the two Arab Colleges providing a full secondary curriculum introduced teaching in Latin and Greek and, for senior pupils, in Greek and Roman History and Greek Philosophy. Sixty pupils took the full course in nine years. Language teaching suffered from lack of time and the results were unequal; but two Arabs went on to take honours degrees in Classics in Britain, and another has published a translation of Horace into Arabic prose and intends to do the same for the *Aeneid*. History and philosophy were pursued with interest and profit. In spite of the difficulties of the time and the limitations of the scheme, its sponsors felt that it had justified itself by imparting a new element of variety to Arab culture and hope that with the return of settled administration classical studies will regain their place in Arab higher education.

A correspondent writes: The seventieth birthday of Marcus Niebuhr Tod might—and, in earlier and more opulent times, would—have been made the occasion of the production of a noble and even physically weighty *Festschrift*. We are all his debtors—every one of us who has made even the least study of Greek inscriptions during the generation that now is. Alas, the Tod *Festschrift* must be considered a war casualty; but in its stead it is right and proper that the Press of his University should have produced with appropriate elegance of Greek and Latin type a bibliography of his work, with a characteristic photograph as frontispiece, and with the text of the genethliac *ἡμέτερα* in his honour signed by eighty of his colleagues and pupils.

The bibliography runs to two hundred items; a figure which becomes even

more impressive when one considers what manner of books he has been chosen to review, or when one remembers the incidence of references per page in any 'number' of 'The Progress of Greek Epigraphy', and what lies behind each several reference. The reader who feels that he must criticize at all costs might perhaps express vain regrets that we have here no account of Captain Tod's contributions to the common stock of knowledge in the years 1917-18; or he might question whether, in an address to a great epigraphist, the Greek language should not have been restored to its fifth-century Attic purity by the ejection of *etas*, *omegas*, and accents. For us it suffices to join with the signatories of the *psephisma* in wishing to Dr. Tod many years more of service to epigraphy and of the enjoyment of his studies and the affection of his friends.

The Ashmolean Museum's winter Exhibition of Air-Photographs of Archaeological Sites (November 1948 to February 1949) was itself a 'second edition' of a more informal exhibition, using much of the same material, which was shown by the Museum on the occasion of the Conference of Classical Societies at Oxford in August 1948. It is to be hoped that it, like the Kodak exhibition of air-photographs of British sites which was on view at other centres last winter, will also be the precursor of others of the kind, and will promote the increased use of air-photography, not only as an aid to surface reconnaissance by archaeologists, who are well aware of its usefulness, but for educational purposes. The completeness with which, under favourable conditions, the whole ground-plan of a Roman *villa* with its out-buildings, a Celtic or Roman field-system, a barrow completely ploughed out, or the line of a long derelict Roman road can appear in an air-photograph, even when it is quite indistinguishable on the surface, remains astonishing long after one has

become familiar with it. Air-photographs can be among the most potent means of catching the imagination and bringing a realization of the reality of the past. Among aids to the more living study of classical and other past civilizations, this study of the 'great palimpsest' of the British and other countryside should in all future generations take a prominent place.

Mr. D. B. Harden's *Guide* to the Ashmolean exhibition (2s. net) is given a permanent value, outlasting the duration of the exhibition itself, by its admirable plates. These do not attempt to represent the whole exhibition, which extended to Roman sites on the Continent and in North Africa, but confine their attention to Wessex. (Similar publications covering other regions of Britain at such a modest price would have great educational value.) The sixteen plates of the *Guide* are taken entirely from those which were bequeathed to Oxford University by the late Major G. W. G. Allen; and this well-produced pamphlet may thus serve as a memorial to the too-little-known work of one who was the chief pioneer of air-photography in the service of archaeology in Britain.

The latest number (XVII) of *L'Antiquité Classique*, a large volume of nearly 600 pages, takes the form of a Festschrift (*Miscellanea Philologica, Historica et Archaeologica*) presented to Dr. Hubert van de Weerd, Professor of Ancient History in the University of Ghent, in celebration of his professorial jubilee. The majority of the forty-six contributions, as is natural and proper, are archaeological; among the others are articles on the Development of Ancient Greek Diplomacy (F. E. Adcock), Art and History in Contemporary Homeric Studies (W. den Boer), the Three Muses of Helicon (B. A. van Groningen), Magic in Theocritus and Virgil (J. Gessler), the Date of the *Cyclops* (H. Grégoire), the *Amphitryo* (L. Herrmann), and the *De Haruspicum Responsis* (M. van den Bruwaene).

## A RECONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEM OF THE AXES IN ODYSSEY XXI

WHAT follows is a criticism of the solution to this problem presented by Mr. H. W. Stubbs in *C.R.* lxii (1948), pp. 12-13, and an attempt to vindicate the traditional solution rejected by almost all lexicographers and commentators since 1876, with special reference to the lexicography of the crucial word *στελειή* in *Od.* xxi. 422.

(a) Mr. Stubbs suggests that the proposed feat of archery consisted in shooting an arrow below the blades of the axes, standing in a line on their handles, and above the floor so that 'it would go out of the front door'. The Greek will not stand this. Homer's phrases are: *διοῖ-στεύσῃ πελέκεων δυοκαίδεκα πάντων, διοῖ-στεύσαι τε σιδήρου, διὰ δ' ἦκε σιδήρου*.<sup>1</sup> The emphatic repetition of *δια-* or *διὰ* with the genitive must mean 'through, inside', or 'between' with the plural and 'through, inside', or 'within' with the singular.<sup>2</sup> In other words, *διὰ* with the genitive in Homer normally, one might even say always, denotes 'within the natural limits of the object or objects specified'. Here it could not possibly imply 'between the axes and the floor' or, more simply, 'under the axes'. Nor would that be a particularly difficult shot. And what about the crucial *πρώτης στελειῆς*?

(b) S. argues that the axes were erected not in the hall but in the yard (which is Bérard's view also, in his note on xxi. 120), because otherwise the suitors could have used them against Odysseus. But Monro's objections to this (on xxi. 120 ff.) must first be answered. Moreover, the suitors already had their swords (xxii. 74, 79-80, 90, 98), but wisely decided not to

risk approaching Odysseus' arrows and Telemachus' spear, preferring to shelter behind the furniture. The unwieldy battle-axes would have had first to be pulled out of the ground in the exposed centre of the hall. Further, the probability is, as noted below, that there were no handles in the axe-heads.<sup>3</sup> Also Homer states that the axes were erected *ἐν μεγάροις* (xix. 573; cf. xxi. 4). This is not absolutely conclusive, since in Penelope's dream (xix. 540, 552) the same phrase seems to mean vaguely 'about the place, on the premises'. But it could hardly be used to mean precisely the opposite of its normal meaning 'indoors', in other words as an exact synonym for *ἐν αὐλῇ*, as Stubbs's view requires. As to the argument that 'the suitors would hardly have been eating so nonchalantly [xxii. 9 ff.] if arrows were flying about inside the hall', only one arrow, the competition shot, had flown in the hall, and its course was carefully prescribed. Homer's narrative is telescoped a little to express the speed and unexpectedness of Odysseus' action after his leap from the stool near the main entrance to the hall, where Telemachus had strategically placed him earlier (xx. 257-8), to the threshold—that spectacular leap which Plato (*Ion* 535B) judged one of the most striking incidents in epic poetry.

The main problem remains. How were the axes arranged so that an arrow could go 'through the iron'?

Homer gives three brief descriptions of their arrangement and the shot:

(a) In xix. 572-5 Penelope says:

... νῦν γὰρ καταθήσω ἀέθλον,  
τοὺς πελέκεας, τοὺς κείνους ἐν μεγάροις ἐοίαν  
ἴσασχ' ἐξείης, δρυόχους ὥς, δώδεκα πάντας·  
στὰς δ' ὁ γε πολλὸν ἀνέυθε διαρρίπτασκεν ἰστόν.

Two points may be noted in passing: *τοὺς πελέκεας*, 'those <celebrated> axes',

<sup>3</sup> It is incorrect to say that 'Homer definitely describes the helms as being buried in the ground'. Significantly, he never mentions the handles at all, except possibly in the disputed *στελειή* (see below).

<sup>1</sup> See xix. 578 and xxi. 76; xix. 587 (cf. xxi. 97, 114, 127); xxi. 328; and cf. xix. 575 and xxi. 420-2 (quoted below).

<sup>2</sup> In *Od.* xii. 102, referring to the distance between Scylla and Charybdis, *διοιστεύσεως* has no object, but most naturally means 'from one to the other', i.e. *through* the space between the two; cf. Rieu's 'and the distance between them is no more than a bowshot'. I can find no support in Homeric usage for the interpretation 'across the intervening space' in anything but a loose sense.

and *στάς* . . . *πολλὸν ἀνέυθε*, which may well mean 'taking up his position at a wide distance from them', and is no clear proof that Odysseus did not crouch down to shoot (as Goebel and his followers argued).

(b) In xxi. 120-3 Telemachus arranges the axes:

πρῶτον μὲν πελέκας στήσεν, διὰ τάφρον δρύζας  
πᾶσι μίαν μακρὴν, καὶ ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνεν,  
ἀμφὶ δὲ γαίαν ἐναΐε.

(c) In xxi. 420-3 Odysseus achieves the shot:

ἦκε δ' ὀϊστόν  
ἄντα τιτυσκομένους, πελέκεων δ' οὐκ ἤμβροτε πάντων  
πρωτῆς στείλειψ, διὰ δ' ἄμπερὲς ἦλθε θύραζε  
ἰὸς χαλκοβαρῆς.

Unhappily for our attempts to understand these passages the three words that should make everything clear—*πελέκας*, *δρύζους*, *στείλειψ*—are gravely ambiguous. *δρύζους* I find quite hopelessly so. The ancient commentators and lexicographers offer five suggestions,<sup>1</sup> namely, the stocks or props on which the keel of a ship under construction was supported, the keel and ribs of such a ship, axes with wooden handles, the handle-holes of axes, or simply axes. Even if one dismisses the last three as mere guesses of floundering Homerists, a formidable ambiguity remains, which experts in shipbuilding do not help to decide. Torr (*The Ancient Ship*, p. 39) plumps for 'ribs', Koester (*Das Antike Seewesen*, pp. 71-2) for 'props'. And editors are equally undecided. Monro, admitting this, tries to salvage too much: 'In any case we are to imagine a straight line of upright pieces of timber.' There is no evidence for uprightness: both ribs and props may incline. A further perplexity is that there is no knowing from what point of view the row of axes was like *δρύζοι*: from above, from the side, or end-on? It may be that *δρύζους* ὡς refers only to the straightness of the line (cf. *ἐπὶ στάθμην ἴθυνεν*), a one-point comparison in the

Homeric manner. It is safest, failing further evidence, to take it so.

The ambiguity in *πέλεκυς* is simpler, but equally unfortunate. It can mean either an axe fitted with its handle or else an axe-head alone.<sup>2</sup> Though the second interpretation, 'axe-head', cannot be conclusively established in the passages under review, two indications make it preferable. Homer, in the lines quoted above and in xxi. 3, 10, 61, mentions only the *σίδηρος*, never the handles (except possibly in the dubious *στείλειψ*). Also it is likely that such valuable and bulky iron objects would be stored in the *ὄγκιον* (xxi. 61) without any wooden attachment, to save space.

So far, so bad. The supreme crux remains in the phrase *πρωτῆς στείλειψ*. Both its syntax and its lexicography are warmly disputed. It has been construed as a genitive of the point of departure, a genitive absolute, a genitive in apposition to *πελέκεων*, or as the direct object of *ἤμβροτε* with *πελέκεων* depending on it. Also *πρωτῆς* may simply mean 'the first' or according to a familiar Homeric idiom 'the edge of, the tip of'. Most of the more recent commentators agree that it is best to construe it either as 'he did not miss the first (or the tip of the) *στείλειψ* of all the axes' or 'he did not miss all the axes at the first (or tip of the) *στείλειψ*'.

But what is the *στείλειψ*? Here a curious lexicographical tale unfolds. Till the year 1876 no lexicographer, as far as I can find, doubted that it meant 'handle-hole'. In that year A. Goebel in *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie*, xxii, pp. 169-73, launched an attack on this view arguing that it must mean 'handle' as in Apollonius Rhodius iv. 957. His interpretation was adopted with modifications by almost all subsequent edi-

<sup>2</sup> It is astonishing that LS<sup>9</sup>, Cunliffe, and Autenrieth do not list the second meaning, which is clearly indicated in *Od.* v. 234-6 and ix. 391, and expounded in Eustathius 1879. 7 f. Eustathius also notes (1878. 40 f.: cf. schol. on *Il.* xxiii. 850) that the word can mean a kind of weight (cf. Hesychius on *ἡμιπέλεκκον* and Leaf on *Il.* xxiii. 851 ff.), which introduces the remote possibility that what Odysseus shot through was not a row of axes at all.

<sup>1</sup> See scholia and Eustathius on xix. 574; *Etymologicum Magnum*, s.v.; Apollonius, *Lex.* 60. 23, as well as the references in LS<sup>9</sup>. I am grateful to Mr. W. R. Smyth for help here and elsewhere in this article.



tors and lexicographers.<sup>1</sup> Probably the chief reason for its ready acceptance was that it allowed expositors to introduce an extraordinary display of recently excavated freak axes, while any ordinary axe could show the simple handle-hole of the older view.

Goebel and his supporters offer two main objections to the older view. The first is that *στελειή* (or *στελεά*, *στελεή*) means 'handle' wherever it recurs in Greek literature. LS<sup>9</sup> cites four examples. There are really only two, for the text is corrupt in Nicander, *Theriaca* 387,<sup>2</sup> and Aeneas Tacticus 18. 10.<sup>3</sup> This leaves only Apollonius Rhodius iv. 957, and a gloss from Antiphanes cited by Hesychius (see LS<sup>9</sup>). Against this stand in solid phalanx all the ancient commentators and lexicographers,<sup>4</sup> that is, the whole weight of Alexandrian and Graeco-Roman learning. Why should the usage of one irresponsible comic poet and one often misguided Alexandrian be preferred to these? One might as well trust Browning rather than Skeat for the interpretation of a Chaucerian gloss.

Goebel's second argument is equally unconvincing. Citing the neuter form *στελειόν*, which unquestionably means 'handle' in *Od.* v. 236, he quotes other synonyms with varying gender, such as *πλευρόν*, *πλευρή*, and argues that the two forms *στελειόν*, *-ή*, must similarly be synonymous. But a reference to the far

fuller lists in Kuehner-Blass, *Ausführliche Grammatik*, i. 1, pp. 501-3, shows that, at any rate as far as Homeric usage is concerned, semantic variation is commoner than non-variation in such doublets. Goebel cites only two valid Homeric instances of non-variation, *δρέπανον*, *-η*, *ἄκρον*, *-η*, while against these there are *ἡλάκατα*, *-η*, *θάλαμος*, *-η*, *κνημός*, *-η*, *κοῖτος*, *-η*, *πέτρος*, *-η*, *στέφανος*, *-η*, with probable differences of meaning. When the doublets are obviously adjectival, like *στελειόν*, *-ή*, the chief problem is what substantive originally went with each. For *στελειόν*, *-ή*, I suggest *ξύλον* and some feminine word for an aperture.<sup>5</sup>

Two alleged practical objections remain. It has been argued that the handle-holes would have been too narrow, and that if the axe-heads were erected on their blades in the ground the aperture would be too low, for a feasible shot. But the discoveries at Crete have disproved this and have rebuked Goebel's mockery of Faesi for suggesting (on xix. 574) an axe-head 2 feet wide. Evans (*Palace of Minos*, i, p. 436) found one spanning nearly 4 feet, 120 cm. to be exact, with a handle-hole of about 5 inches, as well as others well over 2 feet wide. Odysseus' axes, stored away as choice specimens, could have approximated to this. If so, the handle-holes would have been quite broad enough and high enough for a Robin Hood to shoot through the whole row.

No other grave objection to the traditional view has been offered.

To sum up: there are clearly still too many semasiological uncertainties in Homer's phrases to warrant any sure interpretation of his exact intentions. But the ancient view has not yet been discredited. We may still take it that

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Merry, Hamilton, Hentze, Monro, Autenrieth, Helbig, Cunliffe, LS<sup>9</sup> (the 8th edition having given the old view). It is significant that in 1890 Van Leeuwen and Da Costa emphatically followed Goebel, but in 1917 Van Leeuwen, realizing the importance of the repeated *διά σιδήρου*, returned to the traditional interpretation.

<sup>2</sup> Schneider reads the neuter *στελειόν* (see below). There is a similar uncertainty in *Alexipharmaca* 46, where *καυλόν* has a *v.l.* *καυλέα*.

<sup>3</sup> There is a lacuna here. But the most recent editors, Hunter and Handford, who had no Homeric axe to grind, emend so as to take *στελεά* as 'handle-hole', citing Casaubon and Stephanus in their favour. They refer to some unpublished notes by Herbert W. Greene as supporting the new view. These notes were presumably the cause of the change in LS<sup>9</sup> (see Preface p. x).

<sup>4</sup> Scholia on *Od.* xix. 578, xxi. 422; Eustathius 1531. 35 f., 1879. 7 f., 1915. 37 f.; *Elym. Mag.* 726. 52; Moeris 254; Hesychius s.v. (despite the gloss cited above); and cf. schol. on *Il.* xxiii. 851.

<sup>5</sup> *σπή* is not attested for Homer, except possibly in *ἀνοπαία*. I mention here with diffidence and without elaboration that a primitive sexual symbolism might be involved in the use of feminine forms in such word-groups, as, for example, in *σπή*, *σπείας*, *τρήπα*, *τρήπανον* (but also *τρυνάνη*). Similarly firemen speak of the part of a hose into which the 'male' end fits as the 'female' end. Freudians could pursue a lively ποταμόν *ὄρνιν* by treating the whole competition for Penelope as a congeries of symbolisms.



these large axe-heads were set up in the μέγαρον in such a way that Odysseus, and he alone, could, as he sat on a low stool, shoot an arrow through their handle-holes; and we may translate xxi. 420-1, 'He did not miss the top of the handle-hole of each of the axe-heads, so that the bronze-tipped arrow went out (θύραζε) right through them.' The shot depended on shooting through the first hole in such a way that the arrow would also pierce all the others. The arrow would drop slightly in its trajectory, no matter how strongly it was shot, so that Odysseus must shoot as high up as possible in each hole, πρωτῆς στείλειης πάντων πελέκων.<sup>1</sup>

It is not as if the post-Goebelian solutions are less open to objection. They are all compelled by their interpretation of στείλειη to make the arrow graze 'the tip of the handle'. This would inevitably deflect the arrow from its

<sup>1</sup> Or possibly Homer, aiming at τὸ εἰκός, not τὸ δυνατόν, ignored the inevitable drop in trajectory and πρωτῆς στ. simply means 'the nearest handle-hole'. The drop would not be great if the axes were close together, in a row of, say, about 18 feet long.

course. And one must ask why, if the arrow had to pass through a certain row of apertures, it should be made to graze anything (except possibly the top edge of the handle-hole to allow for the drop in trajectory, but that also would be very risky). And secondly, if στείλειη is 'handle', how did Odysseus shoot διὰ σιδήρου? Here the exhibition of freak axes begins,<sup>2</sup> and there has been no little clashing of axe against axe. Goebel sent his arrow between the incurving horns of a double-headed axe. But this demands a curvature much greater than any ancient axe has shown, and it strains the meaning of διὰ σιδήρου too far. Lang and Monro, rejecting this, preferred various kinds of perforated blade. These certainly make sense of διὰ σιδήρου, but all, besides being very eccentric types, are what Homer called ἡμιπέλεκκα, not πελέκας. And in every case Homer's alleged reference to the tip of the handles is entirely pointless.

W. B. STANFORD.

Trinity College, Dublin.

<sup>2</sup> See Goebel, loc. cit.; Butcher and Lang, p. 479, 1893 edn.); Monro, p. 176.

### THREE NOTES ON ARISTOPHANES, WASPS

485 'Will you let me be', asks Bdelycleon of the chorus, ἡ δέδοκται μοι δέρεσθαι καὶ δέρειν δι' ἡμέρας;

Starkie seeks to explain this difficult μοι by translating: 'or is it decreed for me to be fayed . . .?' This seems to me impossible Greek. If the manuscripts are right it is better to take μοι as ethic: 'or is it decreed, I should like to know, . . .?' Bergk's σοι (with δέδοκται) gives a singular which, the question being addressed to all the chorus, not to the coryphaeus, is in any case awkward, and is doubly so after the ὑμεῖς of the previous line. This point did not escape Van Leeuwen, who, in his first edition,<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In the second edition he abandoned this in favour of Hirschig's δέδοκται λοιδορεῖσθαι on the ground that, on the analogy of *Ran.* 857 (ἐλεγχ' ἐλέγχου) and ib. 861 (δάκνειν δάκνεσθαι), the active infinitive should precede the passive. Hirschig's suggestion is mentioned (in a note) in the first edition with the admirable comment, 'sed δέρεσθαι καὶ δέρειν quin sincera sit lectio non videtur dubium'.

boldly printed δέδοχθ' ἡμῖν—a most unlikely suggestion. We should, perhaps, read τοι, which particle may have dropped out by haplography, . . .ταί τοι (μοι being a 'fill up'), or have been corrupted into μοι. For τοι in questions cf. *Ar. Eccl.* 321 ἡ πανταχοῦ τοι νυκτός ἐστιν ἐν καλῷ; (Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 545).

570-3

κάπειθ' ὁ πατὴρ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν  
ὥσπερ θεὸν ἀντιβολεῖ με τρέμων τῆς εὐθύνης  
ἀπολῦσαι.  
'εἰ μὲν χαιρεῖς ἀνὸς φωνῇ, παιδὸς φωνῇ  
ἐλεῖσαι.'  
εἰ δ' αὖ τοῖς χοιριδίοις χαιρῶ, θυγατρὸς φωνῇ  
με πιδέσθαι.

So the manuscripts and the Oxford text. But, if nothing else, ἐλεῖσαι is impossible in Attic comedy. Hence the acceptance by most editors of ἐλεῖσαι (either as an epexegetic infinitive after ἀντιβολεῖ or as an infinitive for imperative: so Starkie) or ἐλεῖσαι (Madvig). But even these leave us with

a very odd mixture of *oratio recta* and *obliqua*; and to refer, as Starkie does, to Aristophanes' 'habit of passing into *oratio obliqua* and vice versa abruptly' is a little disingenuous; for, though Aristophanes does pass from *oratio obliqua* to *recta* (see *Vesp.* 794-5), he does not, I think, pass from *recta* to *obliqua* (Starkie's citation of *Lys.* 519-20 does not seem to me relevant). Blaydes boldly wrote *εἰ μὲν γ' ἄρνός φωνῇ χαίρω, . . . ἐλεῆσαι*. If only on the principle of being as well hanged for a sheep as for a lamb, might we not write *καὶ μὲν γ' ἄρνός . . . ἐλεῆσαι*? We then get an absolutely grammatical construction: *ὁ πατὴρ ἀντιβολεῖ με τῆς εὐθύνης ἀπολῦσαι, καί, εἰ μὲν ἄρνός φωνῇ χαίρω, φωνὴν ἐλεῆσαι, εἰ δ' αὖ χοιριδίου χαίρω, θυγατρὸς φωνῇ πιθέσθαι*. (I share Blaydes's dislike of the redundant *με* in l. 573, but his suggestion of *[με]* *πειπιθέσθαι* will scarcely do, as this reduplicated aorist seems not to be found outside Homer and his later imitators.)

1037-8

φησὶν τε μετ' αὐτοῦ  
τοῖς ἡπάλους ἐπιχειρήσαι πέρυσιν καὶ τοῖς  
πυρετοῖσιν.

Aristophanes in the parabasis claims that after attacking Cleon (and no one doubts that ll. 1029-37 refer to the attack made in the *Knights* in 424) he made an assault on 'the agues and fevers'. The theory (based on the scholia) that the agues and fevers denote the sophists, still adhered to by, for example, Merry, and that in consequence the reference is to the *Clouds*, is disproved, if by nothing else, by the fact that at l. 1044 the *Clouds* and its failure really are referred to. Years ago Meineke suggested that the play here meant is the *Ολκάδες*, yet as far as I know no editor has seen that

the reference *must* almost certainly be to the *Ολκάδες*. The word *πέρυσιν* can only mean that the play in question was produced in 423. Now in the first hypothesis to the *Peace* we are told, *οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης Ἀριστοφάνης τὸ δράμα τέθεικεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς Ἀχαρνεῖς καὶ τοὺς Ἰππέας καὶ Ὀλκάδας, καὶ πανταχοῦ τοῦτο ἐσπούδακεν, τὸν δὲ Κλέωνα κωμωδῶν . . .*, and indeed no one doubts that this play contained an attack on Cleon and the *συκοφάνται*.<sup>1</sup> As to the date of production, Cleon was killed in September 422, so it must be prior to that; and, as the hypothesis of the *Peace* mentions the *Ολκάδες* after the *Acharnians* of 425 and the *Knights* of 424, it is not an unreasonable assumption that the author was citing these plays in chronological order<sup>2</sup>—which would date the *Ολκάδες* to 423. (Admittedly, as the *Knights* was produced at the *Lenaea* of 424, chronological order would still be kept if we could attribute the *Ολκάδες* to the *Dionysia* of that year. But almost certainly Aristophanes produced his *Γεωργοί* at that festival.<sup>3</sup>)

Incidentally it may be pointed out that this view saves the *μετ' αὐτοῦ* of the manuscripts. Aristophanes in the *Ολκάδες* *did* attack the agues and fevers (= the 'sycophants') together with Cleon. Bentley's *μετ' αὐτόν*, accepted by Starkie and Coulton and others, is quite unnecessary. M. PLATNAUER.

Brasenose College, Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kock, *C.A.F.* i, p. 498 (on fr. 411): 'desumpta sunt ex epirrhemate, quo sycophantas cum patrono suo Cleone exagitatos esse consensaneum est'.

<sup>2</sup> Geissler, *Chronologie der altattischen Komödie*, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> Zieliński, *Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, p. 106, n. 2, is sceptical on this point.

## TWO NOTES ON HORACE

- (1) quid obliquo laborat  
lympha fugax trepidare rivo? (*Odes* ii. 3. 11)

THE traditional interpretation of *obliquus* is 'winding', from Pseudo-Acro's laconic *flexuoso* to the more elaborate explanations of modern editors, e.g. Page: 'The channel winds and twists, and so the water in its eagerness to escape has to hurry and bustle and struggle to make

its way at all.' The alleged twistings of the stream are thus rivalled by the mental contortions of some of the commentators in their efforts to preserve a most unnatural interpretation.

Two objections suggest themselves. (1) The notions of rapid stream and winding course do not well agree. A winding river does not hurry along: it

meanders slowly. The only factor that produces a rapid stream is a steep gradient, and it is surely fanciful, not to say fantastic, to represent the stream struggling to escape from the bends in its channel. Horace is picturing only a short stretch of some familiar mountain stream as it tumbles down past him. He has the same scene in mind in *Epist.* i. 10. 21 '(aqua) quae per pronum trepidat cum murmure rivum', and the presence of the key word *trepidare* in both passages shows that the two are to be compared, not, as Wickham writes, contrasted. We should therefore expect *obliquo* in the first passage to describe the same idea as *pronum* in the second, namely, a steep gradient.

(2) Can *obliquo rivo* in any case mean 'a winding channel'? The basic meaning of *obliquus* is 'in a direction other than straight ahead', so that it can denote either 'from the side', like the snake darting across the road *per obliquum* (Hor. *Od.* iii. 27. 6); or 'slanting across', like Ovid's swimmer *ab obliquo qui cum descendere possit* (Rem. Am. 121); or 'slanting down', like the piles described by Caesar as being thrown off the vertical by the force of the river current: *ad inferiorem partem fluminis oblique agebantur* (B.G. iv. 17. 9). In each case it is direction that is described: the actual line of the movement or shape is always straight, not crooked. A good parallel to our passage in Horace is to be found in Val. Flacc. i. 484, where we see Acastus hurrying down the mountain-side to join the Argonauts *per obliqui rapidum compendia montis*: here both *rapidum* and *compendia* prove that the hero is taking the shortest way down. I suggest then that *obliquo rivo* in Horace means 'in its downhill course', and believe that this interpretation best suits both the essential meaning of *obliquus* and the context in which it stands here. At least two translators of Horace agree: T. A. Stewart (1890) and W. Coultts (1898) render identically 'its sloping bed'.

If this be right, how did the meaning 'winding' ever come into vogue? I suspect it derives from certain passages in Ovid and Silius, in which *obliquus* is

used with plural nouns to denote more than one change of direction. Ovid represents the river-god Achelous describing himself to King Oeneus as *cur-sibus obliquis inter tua regna fluentem* (Met. ix. 18). Here we clearly have a zigzagging stream, but the expression is a plural one and means quite naturally a succession of slanting courses. Silius paints the same picture with the verb, and characteristically so elaborates his sentence that there shall be no doubt as to his meaning and nothing need be left to the reader's imagination: 'nam qua curvatas sinuosus flexibus amnis / obliquat ripas refluoque per aspera lapsu / in sese redit' (xv. 621-3). Zigzags, to be sure, but again the expression is plural. Lucan, on the other hand, writes of rivers in flood diverting their waters off their proper course, *vastos obliquent flumina fontes* (iv. 117), and here only one change of direction in each case is intended.

There remain two other passages in Ovid in which the meaning 'sloping' seems to me to give better sense than the accepted 'winding', though either is possible, and both expressions are plural. His account of the creation includes the line *fluminaque obliquis cinxit declivia ripis* (Met. i. 39), which may well describe the steep slope of the banks that enclose a mountain torrent, with *declivia* here playing the part of Horace's *obliquo* and *pronum*. And when Hypsipyle talks of Medea's witchcraft in *Her.* vi. 87 *illa refrenat aquas obliquaque flumina sistit*, the interpretation of *obliqua* as 'downhill' makes a much more pointed antithesis to *sistit* than does the seemingly irrelevant 'winding'.

(2) et stella vesani Leonis (*Odes* iii. 29. 19)

If *stella* really does signify 'constellation', as the commentators say, it is a most remarkable metonymy, for while *sidus* is often transferred by the poets to denote a single heavenly body, it seems an accepted rule that *stella* should mean only a single one. Macrobius, *Comm. Somn. Scip.* i. 14, puts the rule clearly, and the practice of the poets bears this out. The dictionaries, it is

true, list several other passages in which *stella* is alleged to be used for *sidus*, with the following names: *Saturni* (Virg. G. i. 336), *Coronae* (ibid. 222), *Icarii canis* (Ovid, *Am.* ii. 16. 4), *Milvus* (id. *F.* iii. 793) and *Iovis* (ibid. v. 112). Of these we can at once dismiss three which are not constellations at all, namely the planets Saturn and Jupiter, and Icarus' dog, which is the star Sirius. We are left with the Crown and the Kite, admittedly constellations: but the former is a small and compact group, and the latter may reasonably be presumed to have been the same. (I have not identified it with any certainty, but it is not one of the familiar star-groups in any of the catalogues.)

But *Leo* is another matter: it is a constellation both large and conspicuous, and contains one star of the first magnitude, Regulus. Now if Horace really meant the constellation, why did he not write *sidusque* or *signumque*? My suggestion therefore is that Horace here actually means Regulus, i.e. not 'the constellation of Leo', but 'the bright star in Leo'. I would thus go a step farther than Naylor, who saw the difficulty, but was content to observe that '*stella* is used rather than *sidus* because Regulus is so conspicuous a

member of the constellation'. Moreover it is a curious thing that Regulus, so far as I can make out, is never mentioned by name in extant classical Latin, though the Greeks had for long been calling it *Βασίλεικος*. The name is not unmetrical for the poets; but, what is more surprising, we find Columella calling it *Leonis in pectore clara stella* (xi. 2) and Pliny referring to it by the similar periphrasis *regia in pectore Leonis stella* (*N.H.* xviii. 271). It is significant that Aratus, who is the source of so much of the astronomical lore in the Latin poets of the first century B.C., mentions *Leo* but does not name its brightest star, and his omission may well account for the absence of the name in the Latin authors. At all events there was evidently no special name in current use for Regulus, and it looks as if the star was referred to simply as *stella Leonis*, the Lion-star, just as we may speak of the Dog-star when we mean Sirius, the very bright star in the constellation of the Dog. Royalty, moreover, was the special attribute of the lion, traditionally called the king of beasts and associated in astrology with royal births, so that the names of star and constellation could be very easily equated. D. A. KIDD.

University of Aberdeen.

### A NOTE ON ATHENIAN IMPERIALISM<sup>1</sup>

In the fifth-century Attic decrees that have come down to us there is a long series honouring Proxenoï of Athens. The large number of such decrees is not due merely to the accidents of survival; it is a fair index of the importance of the Proxenos to Athens. For the Proxenos, useful to all states, was particularly useful as an instrument of Athenian empire. Potentially recalcitrant allies could be watched by Athenian *ἄρχοντες*, *φρούροι*, *ἐπισκόποι*, *κληροῦχοι*; they could be even better watched by pro-Athenians among the allies.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This study is founded on Wilhelm's discussion of a group of Attic fifth-century inscriptions in *Sitzb. Wien* ccxvii (5), here cited as Wilhelm. For convenience the corresponding numbers in *S.E.G.* x for the references to *IG.* are given at the end.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Thuc. iii. 2. 3. For a rather different political use of Proxenoï, Thuc. ii. 29. 1.

One of the commonest privileges recorded in these decrees is the guarantee of protection to the Proxenos. Sometimes this is granted in general terms: the generals and Athenian resident magistrates overseas are to see that no harm comes to him, or the Boule and prytanes are to safeguard his interests. In many instances protection takes a more specific form and implies a more sinister undercurrent. If a Proxenos is killed in any state of the empire the same penalty shall apply as in the case of the killing of an Athenian citizen. *IG.* i<sup>2</sup>. 56. 14-17 affords a typical example, involving no restoration:

ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνει ἐν τῶν πόλει  
εὖν ἢν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατοῦσι, τε  
ν τιμορίαν εἶναι καθάπερ ἐάν  
τις Ἀθηναίων ἀποθάνει.



The area in which the protection and penalty apply is defined in terms which differ slightly in form but have the same content. With ἐν τῶν πόλ[εων] ἡδὺν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσι from the example cited we may compare *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 32. 10-11*: ἐν τῶν πόλε[ων] ὅσων Ἀθην[αῖοι] κρατ[έ]ουσιν . . . Such formulae, a sure mark of the Athenian empire, no longer valid in the fourth century, have helped scholars to rescue decrees published among fourth-century Attic inscriptions and to place them in their right chronological context, in the fifth century, before the collapse of the Athenian empire.<sup>1</sup>

Wilhelm has thrown further light on this important aspect of Athenian imperialism by attractive restorations in two inscriptions of the series.<sup>2</sup> In *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 28. 7-13* he suggests:

ἐὰν δέ τις ἀποκτείνει Ἀχελούην  
[α ἔ]στιν παῖδον τιν[ά] ἐν τῶν πόλεόν πο]  
[ῶ]σιν Ἀθηναῖοι κρατῶσιν, τὴν πόλ[ιν]  
10 [ιν] π[ρ]ότε τάλαν[τα] α ὀφείλειν ὅς ἐὰν Ἀθε]  
[ναῖον τις ἀποθάνει, καὶ τὰς τιμὰς]  
[ας] εἶναι κατὰ τοῦτο καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖ]  
[ον ἀπο]θανόντος.

This restoration, implying that Athens fixed collective responsibility on the allied state concerned when an Athenian was killed and imposed a standard penalty of 5 talents, might seem to be confirmed by Wilhelm's similar restoration of *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 38. 1-5*:<sup>3</sup>

. . . [ἐν τῶν πόλεων ὧν]  
[Ἀθηναῖοι] κρατῶσιν, τὴν πόλιν πάντα τὰ  
[παντα] ὀφείλειν Ἀθηναῖοις ὡς ἐὰν Ἀθηναῖ]  
[ον τις ἀπ]οθάνῃ.

Wilhelm found no direct evidence that Athens imposed a fine of 5 talents on allied cities in such cases, but he adduced a useful parallel from Diodorus (xiv. 16. 1). The Spartans, after the

overthrow of Athens, 'decreed that the Athenian exiles throughout Greece should be surrendered to the Thirty and that anyone who hindered such surrender should be liable to a penalty of 5 talents'.

It is probable that a more direct reference to this penalty should be seen in a passage of Aristophanes' *Peace* (164-72) which has puzzled the commentators.

ἀνθρωπε, τί θρῆς, οὗτος ὁ χέζων  
ἐν Πειραιεὶ παρὰ ταῖς πόρταις;  
ἀπολεῖς μ', ἀπολεῖς. οὐ κατορύξεις  
κάπιφορήσεις τῆς γῆς πολλήν,  
κάπιφυτεύσεις ἔρπυλλον ἄνω  
καὶ μύρον ἐπιχεῖς; ὥς ἦν τι πεσὼν  
ἐνθένδε πάθω, τοῦμοι θανάτου  
πέετε τάλανθ' ἢ πόλις ἡ Χίων  
διὰ τὸν σὸν πρῶκτον ὀφλήσει.

The humour of this passage is not refined, but the sense is clear enough. Trygaeus is off on his dung-beetle to interview the gods on important business. In the Piraeus a man eases himself. The beetle plunges towards such an unexpected meal. Trygaeus faces a sudden and inglorious death. But why, if he is killed, should the state of Chios pay 5 talents? The answer is given by, and in turn confirms, Wilhelm's restoration. It was the penalty to be paid by an allied city for the death of an Athenian citizen. It remains to explain the specific allusion to Chios, though that is of secondary importance. The suggestion<sup>4</sup> that a pun is intended we may discount: Aristophanes used puns freely, but he had a surer touch than to associate χέζων and Χίων. That he chose Chios merely to particularize without further motive is less than we should expect from him. More probably we should see here a topical reference to a recent case in which Chios was held responsible for an Athenian citizen's death. That Chios had recently been under suspicion we know from other evidence. In 427 friends of the Spartans in Chios made a contribution to the half-hearted naval expedition of Alcidas.<sup>5</sup> In the winter of 425/4 the Chians were ordered to dismantle their new

<sup>1</sup> See especially Eleanor Weston, *A.J.P.* lxi (1940), 345.

<sup>2</sup> Wilhelm, 17-24.

<sup>3</sup> Wilhelm, 23. Eleanor Weston, l.c. 347 f., associated *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 71* with *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 38* as two fragments from the same decree. If this association were valid, Wilhelm's restoration, based on a line of 32 letters, would need drastic revision, for *IG. ii<sup>2</sup>. 71* demands a line of only 28 letters. The argument for associating the fragments, however, is based on the general appearance of letter forms and the supposed length of line. There is no join. Meritt, *Hesperia*, x (1941), rejects the association and accepts Wilhelm's restorations.

<sup>4</sup> Budé edition, vol. ii, p. 104, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, 62. 9.



wall by the Athenians, who suspected that they meant to rebel.<sup>1</sup> A recently recovered fragment of a decree, possibly of the same year, refers to pledges exacted from the island.<sup>2</sup> Against such a background the assassination of an Athenian in Chios or by a Chian shortly before the production of the *Peace* in 421 can readily be imagined.

At some point in the development of the empire Athens imposed this principle of collective responsibility on her allies to protect Athenian citizens. This is a sure sign of developed imperialism: why and when was it introduced? The natural assumption is that the penalty was imposed at a time of unrest in view of actual assassinations of Athenians in the empire. None of the decrees concerned carries a date, but letter-forms provide a probable *terminus ante quem*. For two decrees of the series (*IG. i<sup>2</sup>. 27* and 28)<sup>3</sup> have the three-barred sigma which is not found in any Attic inscription which can be securely dated after 445. The crisis that followed the *Peace* of Callias in the early forties, during which widespread disaffection among the allies is most convincingly mirrored in the tribute quota lists, provides an admirable historical setting.<sup>4</sup> The possibility, however, of a date in the fifties cannot, in our present state of knowledge, be ruled out.<sup>5</sup>

The new safeguard for the protection of Athenian citizens in the empire was presumably embodied in a decree. We should very much like to know its content. Did the principle of collective responsibility apply only where the murderer was undetected or was the state held responsible even where the murderer was known? Common sense favours the former view, but the terms of the formula might seem to imply the latter. Was the state held responsible only if an Athenian was killed in its own territory, or was the penalty also ap-

plied to the state if an Athenian was killed by one of its citizens in any part of the empire? Again common sense favours the first interpretation; but the passage from the *Peace* would have more point under the second interpretation. Until we have more evidence the precise content of the decree must remain uncertain.

The protection afforded to Athenian citizens could be extended to Proxenoï. In his restoration<sup>6</sup> of *IG. i<sup>2</sup>. 27. 13-17* Wilhelm implies that it was extended to all Proxenoï.

... και ἄν τις ἀποκτείνει τ]  
 ὡ' αὐτὸν ἐν [τὸν πόλεον ὅσον Ἀ]  
 θεναῖοι κρατοῦν, τιμορίαν]  
 εἶναι [αὐτοῦ ἔπερ τοῖς προχσέ]  
 νοῖς ἐφ' ὁσέφισται].

That this protection, however, did not follow automatically from the grant of Proxenia is strongly suggested by the decrees in honour of Leonidas of Halicarnassus (*IG. i<sup>2</sup>. 56*). On that part of the stone which has been preserved Leonidas is not described as a Proxenos, but the general content of the decrees makes that assumption reasonable. It is only in the second decree that his life is protected with the same sanctions as an Athenian. A better restoration may be inferred from a formula in *IG. i<sup>2</sup>. 28. 11-13*:

[καὶ τὰς τιμορί]  
 [ας εἶναι κατὰ τ[οῦτο καθάπερ Ἀθηναί]  
 [ο ἀπο]θανόν[τες].

A similar formula may be supplied in this case:

[τιμορίαν]  
 εἶναι καθάπερ Ἀθηναῖο ἀποθα]  
 νόν[τες].

In some inscriptions of our series the crime is defined simply as killing—ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνει; in others it is more closely defined as violent killing—ἐάν τις ἀποκτείνει βιαίῳι θανάτῳι. Until the series can be arranged in approximately chronological order it cannot be decided whether the introduction of an explicit reference to violence represents a modification in the terms of the decree which first formulated the policy. We can be more confident that the extended formula of three of the decrees represents

<sup>1</sup> Thuc. iv. 51.

<sup>2</sup> Meritt, *Hesperia*, xiv (1945), 115-19; *S.E.G.* x. 76.

<sup>3</sup> A photograph of *IG. i<sup>2</sup>. 27* in Wilhelm, plate 1.

<sup>4</sup> For the crisis of the early forties, Wade-Gery, *Hesperia*, xiv (1945), 212.

<sup>5</sup> For Athenian imperialism in the fifties, Meiggs, *J.H.S.* lxiii (1943), 21.

<sup>6</sup> Wilhelm, 27.

a change in substance and not merely in form:

IG. ii.<sup>2</sup> 32. 9. καὶ ἐάν τις  
[αὐτὸς] ἐν τῷ μὲν πόλε[ων] ὅσων Ἀθηναίων  
[ἡ κρατ]έος[ι]ν δ[ι]ή[σ]η [ἡ ἀγῆ] ἢ ἀποκτεῖ  
[νῆ] β[ε]βαίως θανά[τω]ι, τὴν τιμωρίαν  
[εἰ]ναι α[φ]έρ[ει] καθά[περ] ἐάν τις Ἀθῆν[α]  
[αἰών] τοιοῦτό[ς] τι [πάθῃ]

A similar formula recurs in IG. i.<sup>2</sup> 154. 10-11 and ii.<sup>2</sup> 73. 7-8. The decree that has been quoted has been dated by Wilhelm<sup>1</sup> to the period of the Sicilian expedition. Neither of the other two examples of the extended formula seems to be early in the series. The natural inference is that some time after the

<sup>1</sup> *Ans. Wien*, xiv. 6 (1911), p. 180 f.

original regulation had been introduced the Athenians extended the principle to cover arrest and imprisonment.

A more detailed study of this series of decrees might throw further light on the development of Athenian imperialism.<sup>1</sup>

RUSSELL MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

<sup>2</sup> Correspondences with S.E.G. x

IG. i.<sup>2</sup> 27 = S.E.G. x. 19

" 28 = " 23

" 56 = " 55

" 154 = " 98

IG. ii.<sup>2</sup> 38 = " 99

" 73 = " 117

I am grateful to Dr. J. J. E. Hondius for enabling me to use proofs of S.E.G. x before publication.

## THE DATE OF PETRONIUS

A RECENT work (E. V. Marmorale, *La Questione Petroniana*, Bari, 1948), of which my review is printed on pp. 28-9, attempts to set aside the generally accepted attribution of the *Satiricon* to the age of Nero in favour of a date at the end of the second century or the beginning of the third.

In this connexion I should like to draw attention to two arguments in support of the accepted dating. One of them is discussed by Marmorale, who draws, I think, the wrong conclusion from it; the other does not seem to have been seriously examined by students of Petronius.

First, the references to the gold ring as the badge of the equestrian order. Ascylltus at Trimalchio's banquet wears a gold ring—*anulus buxeos* (68. 10)—presumably on the third finger of his left hand—as a result of which the freedman Hermeros takes him to be a Roman knight. Ascylltus' true civil status is beside the point: he was probably thought of as a freedman<sup>1</sup> and possibly as a Junian Latin,<sup>2</sup> and there is no reason to suppose that he had the slight-

est right to wear such a ring. What is important is that Hermeros, who treats him with anger and contempt, admits none the less that he is an *eques Romanus* (57. 4).

Now in later times the *ius anulorum* was an honour conferred by the *princeps* upon freedmen, symbolizing a limited *ius ingenuitatis*, but not implying membership of the equestrian order. We have epigraphic evidence for this from the reign of Commodus,<sup>3</sup> and the jurists take it as far back as that of Hadrian.<sup>4</sup> So from Hadrian's reign onwards the gold ring was not an infallible token of equestrian rank,<sup>5</sup> and Hermeros, who is eager to represent Ascylltus in as poor a light as possible, would have had no need to suppose that he was a knight.

unless the cause of his manumission were such as to be approved by a *consilium* of senators and knights or of *recuperatores*. Cf. Gai. i. 18-20.

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.L.* vi. 1847.

<sup>4</sup> Dig. 40. 10. 6 'Ulpianus libro primo ad legem Iuliam et Papianam: Libertinus si ius anulorum impetraverit, quamvis iura ingenuitatis salvo iure patroni nactus sit, tamen ingenuus intellegitur: et hoc divus Hadrianus rescipit.'

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Arthur Stein, *Der römische Ritterstand* (1927), p. 45: 'Während also in der früheren Zeit die Verleihung des Goldringes, sofern die Bedingung des Ritterzensus erfüllt war, die Erwerbung der Ritterwürde in sich schloss und, da die notwendige Voraussetzung hierfür freie Geburt ist, bei Freigelassenen damit zugleich auch eine fiktive Ingenuität ausgesprochen wurde, ist seit Hadrian der Goldring nur das Symbol für die künstlich erlangte Ingenuität selbst.'

<sup>1</sup> Cf. 81. 4 *stupro liber*. In this connexion see L. Debray, 'Pétrone et le droit privé romain', *Nouvelle Revue Historique de Droit français et étranger*, 1919, pp. 19-21.

<sup>2</sup> He was presumably under thirty, and so, whatever the form of his manumission, would be, under the *Lex Aelia Sentia*, in *libertate tuitione praetoris*, and under the *Lex Iunia* a Junian Latin—

The view that the *Satiricon* was written before Hadrian, when the right to wear the ring was still the precious privilege of an *élite*, is borne out by Trimalchio's behaviour. He has an *anulus grandis subauratus* on the little finger of his left hand, and a gold amulet ring with iron stars on the third finger: and he desires to be depicted on his tombstone—by that time he will be well beyond the reach of any sanctions—*praetextatus cum anulis aureis quinque*. Even Trimalchio does not dare to wear a plain gold ring on the third finger of his left hand, though he sails as near the wind as he can. This hardly accords with Marmorale's dating of the *Satiricon* at the turn of the second and third centuries, when freedmen not uncommonly wore the ring as a sign of fictitious *ingenuitas*, and even common soldiers had the *ius anulorum*.<sup>1</sup> Marmorale makes the mistake of assuming that Ascyllus was entitled to the gold ring which he wore, and thus enmeshes himself in a web of contradictions, ending up by ruling out as irrelevant Hermeros' remark *equus Romanus es*.

Second, the system of agriculture practised by large landowners. Trimalchio owns estates in various parts of southern Italy, which he appears to exploit directly by means of slave labour: cf. 37. 9 'familia vero—babae babae! non mehercules puto decumam partem esse quae dominum suum noverit'. Neither in the *acta* (53. 1–10) nor elsewhere is there any indication that Trimalchio lets part of his lands to tenants paying a rent in money or in kind. Similarly Eumolpus, wishing to represent himself as a wealthy landowner from Africa (117. 5–10), speaks of innumerable slaves—'nam familiam quidem tam magnam per agros Numidiaie esse sparsam, ut possit vel Carthaginem capere'—but not of *coloni*.

The word *familia* is often discussed by the jurists,<sup>2</sup> but never defined in such a way as to include *coloni*. Everyday

usage agrees with the lawyers' definitions. A *familia* need not consist entirely, or indeed at all, of slaves, but it does imply a group of persons organized by a superior for a purpose of his own and acting under his control, e.g. a band of gladiators or the employees of a firm of *publicani*. A glance at the passages quoted in *Thes. L.L.* vi. 1. 239. 34–240. 18 will confirm this. There can thus be no doubt that *familia* in the passages cited from Petronius refers to slaves or hired labourers used in direct exploitation of the land, and not to tenants.

Earlier authorities<sup>3</sup> generally held that large-scale cultivation by slaves was succeeded by small-scale tenant farming as the prevailing mode of production about the end of the first century B.C. Most scholars would now speak in less categorical terms: conditions varied from province to province and from region to region within a single province. None the less the colonate was common enough in first-century Italy to be discussed in some detail by Seneca<sup>4</sup> and Columella,<sup>5</sup> who were both concerned primarily with Italian conditions. It seems to have been the principal method by which Pliny the Younger exploited his land.<sup>6</sup> The jurists, who again mainly reflect Italian conditions,<sup>7</sup> indicate that in the second century it was exceptional for an estate to be without *coloni*.<sup>8</sup> In Trimalchio's own Campania we find *coloni*—almost certainly tenants in this passage—at Faustinus' villa at Baiae in Martial iii. 58. 40, and in the second century small tenant farms rather than large slave farms seem to predominate throughout Italy.<sup>9</sup>

In Africa the picture is even clearer. Large-scale farms cultivated by their

<sup>3</sup> Cf. J. K. Rodbertus, 'Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Nationalökonomie des classischen Altertums', *Jahrb. f. Nationalökonomie u. Statistik*, ii (1864), 207–28; Mommsen, *Hermes*, xix (1884), 408–16; I. Greaves, *Journal of the Ministry of Public Instruction*, St. Petersburg, ccclxi (1905), 69 (in Russian), etc.

<sup>4</sup> *Ben.* vi. 4. 4, vii. 5. 2–3, *Ep.* 123. 2, etc.

<sup>5</sup> i. 7 passim. <sup>6</sup> *Ep.* iii. 19, ix. 37.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Seeck in P.W. iv. 1. 484. 18 ff.

<sup>8</sup> *Dig.* 20. 1. 32.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire*, pp. 190–3, 545, n. 15, with literature cited there.

<sup>1</sup> Herodian iii. 8. 5 (Septimius Severus) τοῖς τε στρατιώταις . . . δακτυλίοις χρυσοῖς χρῆσασθαι ἐπέτρεψε.

<sup>2</sup> *Ulp. Dig.* 50. 16. 195. 1–4; *Cod. Iust.* 6. 38. 5. pr.; *Dig.* 21. 1. 25. 2, 47. 8. 2. 14, etc.

owners by means of slaves no doubt existed in the last century of the Republic and in the early Empire. But in the second century there is no longer any trace of this system: Africa is by then a country of small tenant farmers (*coloni*) and large tenant farmers (*conductores*).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 289; *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*, pp. 338 ff.

Both these arguments are difficult to reconcile with a date at the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, and point rather to the generally accepted dating of the work in the reign of Nero.

R. BROWNING.

University College, London.

## LONG-TERM COMMANDS AT THE END OF THE REPUBLIC

In two articles published in the *J.R.S.* in 1939 (xxix. 57-73; 167-83) I argued that in the cases where a special proconsular command was granted for three or five years in the period 70-50 B.C. the appointment of a successor might not be discussed until three or five years later, but that it was always legally possible to end the special command prematurely if it could be established that the purpose for which the command had been created was already achieved.

G. R. Elton in his article, 'The Terminal Date of Caesar's Gallic Proconsulate' (*J.R.S.* xxxvi, 1946, 18-42), has suggested (pp. 19 f.) that there are historical facts which are strong enough to make the theory untenable.

(a) He writes: 'If no discussion'—of Caesar's command—'was allowed before a certain date, why did it continually take place? Why did L. Domitius in 58 and 56 (Suet. *Iul.* 23, 1; 24, 1) and M. Marcellus in 51 (*ibid.* 28, 2) try to start discussions four years, or two years, or one year before the appointed time?'

(b) He writes: 'There is no evidence whatever that Caesar in 59 and 55, and Pompey and Crassus in the latter year, received their provinces for the fulfilment of a special task. . . . Our authorities do not in the least suggest such a possibility in Caesar's case, and we are expressly assured that the *Lex Trebonia* contained no mention of the Parthian war (Plut. *Crassus* 16, 2).'

To this I am bound to answer as follows:

(a) I have nothing to add to what I have written (*op. cit.* 175 f.) about M. Marcellus in 51 B.C. What L. Domitius tried to do in 58 B.C., however (before

Caesar had even gone north to assume his command in the first place), and what (in strict accuracy) he said in 56 B.C. that, if he became consul in 55 B.C., he would do, I did not discuss, because these questions have no bearing at all on the particular problem under consideration. So far from being in accordance with the *Lex Vatinia*, Domitius' action in 58 B.C. and the action which he contemplated taking three years later was a frontal assault on the *Lex Vatinia* itself, a denial that it was a valid *lex*, because it had been passed in disregard of Bibulus' *obnuntiatio*. In the years 58-56 B.C. Optimates never tired of claiming that the popular legislation of 59 B.C. was no legislation at all. Clodius himself tried this game in 57 B.C. (*De domo* 40). Opponents of Caesar took, or were expected to take, this line about the *Lex Vatinia* in the debate on the consular provinces in 56 B.C. (*De provinciis consularibus* 36; cf. 46).

(b) is a better point but not, I venture to think, a strong one. The precise text of the *Lex Vatinia* is unknown to us, and we can only speculate, one way or the other. As for the *Lex Trebonia*, the fullest accounts of which are to be found in Plutarch *Cato minor* 43. 1 and in Cassius Dio xxxix. 33. 2, Crassus would seem to have been given Syria together with authority to wage war outside the boundaries of the province. Plutarch, *Crassus* 16. 2, may very well be right that the actual phrase *bellum Parthicum* did not occur in the *lex*.

All the same, even if it is granted that the fact that Crassus later fought the Parthians may have misled historians in antiquity into assuming as self-



evident that his explicit commission by the *Lex Trebonia* was to wage war with Parthia, it is difficult both from the passages already mentioned and from Velleius Paterculus 2. 46. 2 and Plutarch *Pompeius* 52. 4 to avoid the belief that, whatever the formal nature of the commission, everybody in and out of politics at Rome in 55 B.C. knew that the

governorship of Syria for five years was, in effect, a commission to wage war on Parthia.

As concerns Pompey, Dio Cassius xxxix. 33. 2 (καὶ γὰρ τι καὶ ἔναγχος ἐκεκίνητο) implies that there was a particular job of work to be done in Spain too.

J. P. V. D. BALSDON.

Exeter College, Oxford.

## REVIEWS

### CHARACTERIZATION IN EURIPIDES

Walter ZÜRCHER: *Die Darstellung des Menschen im Drama des Euripides*. (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft 2.) Pp. xii + 197. Basel: Reinhardt, 1947. Paper.

THIS study, which was to have been published as a Supplementheft to *Philologus*, now appears in a new and attractively produced Swiss series. The subject of investigation is whether 'character', as understood by the moderns, is to be found in the plays of Euripides. Z. opens with a brief survey of recent German writings on the Sophoclean character. Dismissing the extreme school of disintegrators, he accepts the view that the personages of Sophocles have a unitary *ethos*, arising out of and required by the action, which is not, however, 'character' in the modern sense. (This debatable proposition is not fully argued and need not be discussed here.) Does the drama of Euripides display, as some have held, a more developed sense of the human individuality? After a detailed examination of *Alc.*, *Med.*, *Hec.*, *Her.*, *El.*, *Or.*, Z. concludes that, although his psychology is more complex, characterization in the full sense is not to be found in Euripides; the personages manifest the psychological phenomena which the action demands, but, although these phenomena are often finely observed, they are not felt as grounded in a unitary personality. Z. holds that the concept of human individuality (*Einheit der Person*) was simply not available at the time when Euripides wrote.

Two questions arise: whether the evidences to which Z. appeals are well

founded, and, if so, whether he has explained them correctly. On the first question it is impossible to avoid subjective judgements. Where Z. sees, for instance, an inconsistency supporting his thesis, another may see a fine piece of psychological insight. Medea is *αὐθάδης* and *δεινὴ*; later, she expresses mother-love. But may not the same woman both love her children for their own sake and hate them for their father's? Is it not entirely natural that Heracles, *καλὸν λίκος ἀλεξίκακος*, should pass through a stage of behaving as *ὁ ἐπιτυχών*, before rising to a new plane of heroism? (One cannot help suspecting a tendency on Z.'s part to have it both ways: if the psychology is simple, it is 'Sophoclean' *ethos*; if complex, the traits are inconsistent.) Z.'s Admetus consists of two traits only—extreme *φιλοξενία* and undeserved misfortune: undeserved, because Z. will not admit that Admetus is critically treated. But what is the function of the scene with Pheres except to imply a criticism of Admetus? And 955 ff. refer, unmistakably, to 717, 723. Is not Admetus as self-centred in his *φιλοξενία* as in his relation to Alcestis? Z. is perhaps not at his best in treating the more sophisticated plays: *Alc.*, *El.*, *Or.* No amount of argument about Electra's fit of conscience at *El.* 1182 ff. can destroy the earlier picture of the heroine luxuriating in a misery which is partly self-inflicted; and the actions of the aristocratic trio in *Or.* are determined, not only by the situation, but by their own fantastic beings.



Much of the evidence on which Z. depends is thus very questionable, but he can point to instances (particularly in the earlier tragedies) where Euripides seems relatively uninterested in the mental processes of his characters (particularly in their transitions from state to state). Is this because he had no conception of personal individuality? This seems unlikely, to say the least, in a contemporary of Socrates. The explanation may lie rather in the detachment with which the characters are treated by Euripides, who is less interested in them as individuals than as illustrations of his dramatic themes: Medea and Hecuba are more important to him as phenomena than as persons. Yet they are persons to the extent to which it suits his book to make them so, and it is incorrect to say that the actions of Euripidean characters never arise out of their inner natures. Those natures and actions may be representative of a class, a sex, or humanity in general,

since drama deals with universals through particulars; they are grounded in circumstance, because all dramatic action is (as Z. himself points out) an interaction of character and situation. The balance between universal and particular, and between character and circumstance, varies greatly in modern, as well as in ancient, dramatists. Z. quotes no examples of the drama of 'character'; but at least the Greeks avoided a trivial particularism.

Much criticism of Greek tragedy has been vitiated by an excessive attention to characterization. The reaction, salutary in itself, has been pushed much too far by Z., among others. However, to go even up a blind alley with an intelligent companion may be a form of progress. Z.'s examination of these plays is sincere, thorough, and often acute; and no one can study it without profit and clarification.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Westfield College, London.

### THUCYDIDES

Jacqueline DE ROMILLY: *Thucydide et l'impérialisme athénien: la pensée de l'historien et la genèse de l'œuvre*. (Collection des Études Anciennes.) Pp. 326. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1947. Paper, 700 fr.

FOR all his learning and his gift of historical imagination Meyer's essay on the composition of Thucydides' *History* does not satisfy, for essentially it leaves the problem unsolved because not properly posed; and for all his learning and acuteness Schwartz's theories were sterile, as were those of Pohlenz and others who so easily refuted him. 'Écrasante par sa bibliographie, nulle par ses résultats, la question de la genèse de l'œuvre peut donc actuellement passer pour le type même du problème vain et désespéré', as Mme de Romilly justly says. Finley's book (of course unknown to her) at last showed a saner approach and a better appreciation of the problem; and now she has given us an analysis which is thorough, a work of great intelligence, and based on a sound method. I cannot do better than quote

some sentences from her introductory chapter:

'L'existence d'un tel problème [that of the genesis of the work] ne pouvait que frapper de paralysie toutes les études relatives à Thucydide: il devenait impossible en effet de traiter aucune question à fond, sans avoir au préalable résolu ce problème;—et impossible aussi de la résoudre directement sans avoir au préalable traité les autres questions....

'Puisque chaque forme d'étude impliquait nécessairement l'autre, il nous a semblé nécessaire de les réunir, et de poser dès l'abord l'existence d'une double inconnue; ainsi les deux ordres d'études, menés parallèlement, étaient destinés à se rendre des services réciproques: ce que l'on dégagerait relativement à l'esprit de Thucydide devait permettre d'arriver à un résultat plus précis concernant la genèse de l'œuvre, et ce résultat, inversement, devait permettre de fixer les idées ainsi dégagées dans la réalité vivante de leur devenir. Autrement dit, il nous a semblé qu'il convenait d'étudier la genèse de l'œuvre à propos d'une idée, d'une habitude ou d'un principe de Thucydide, ou, si l'on préfère, d'étudier cette idée, cette habitude, ce principe en faisant intervenir à son sujet la genèse de l'œuvre.'

Such an idea must be one important in itself and one that informs the *History* from the beginning to the end, and must be subject to change:

'Dans ce domaine, un grand fait s'offrait à nous, présent, plus qu'aucun autre, dans toutes les parties de l'œuvre,—soumis plus qu'aucun autre, aux variations d'opinion, puisque, changeant lui-même de forme avec le temps, il réclamait à chaque instant, en même temps qu'un nouveau jugement, une nouvelle interprétation: ce fait était l'impérialisme athénien.'

Mme de Romilly, then, gives us a study, detailed and profound, both of Athenian imperialism and its development from Pericles to Alcibiades and, closely interwoven with this, of Thucydides' attitude towards it, as that develops contemporaneously. It is a work difficult to summarize, partly because its great value lies in its detailed analysis. The author emphasizes three 'laws of imperialism': political necessity—'lorsque l'on a l'empire, on est détesté; par suite, l'on est obligé de maintenir cet empire par une politique de force' (as she vividly puts it elsewhere, Pericles shows, ii. 63, how Athens was 'en quelque sort prisonnière de son empire'); second, the psychological danger of *ὑβρις*; and third, the general law of force that the weaker must give way to the stronger. Both of these last belong to the nature of man, and both lead to *πλεονεξία*; but whereas *πλεονεξία* due to *ὑβρις* is 'un accident, une mauvaise aventure, que le sage évite' (to be seen therefore in Cleon and Alcibiades, but not in Pericles), the latter is given as a universal rule (*αἰεὶ καθεστῶτος*, κτλ. i. 76. 2). It is, in Thucydides, completely generalized in its expression, a philosophical law, and belongs to the latest stages of his thought. The Melian dialogue, therefore, and part of the Athenian speech at Sparta in book i are among the latest sections of the *History*.

It is perhaps in her treatment of the problem of composition that the soundness of Mme de Romilly's method is most apparent and marks the greatest advance in the study of Thucydides. She realizes that inconsistencies, 'les faux-départs et les retours en arrière', may imply different dates of writing, but not necessarily dates wide apart in time; that a late 'recension' by the author, ascertained perhaps from a few phrases (as probably in the Pylos narrative), does not necessarily mean any

great change in the original version nor any change in the point of view; that a later 'insertion', though of great importance, does not mean that the old context is, as it were, out of date, and so inconsistent—on the contrary, it may have been so left of set purpose (so, for example, the Athenian speech at Sparta); above all, that what is important in this problem is not when a passage was first written, but when it was first thought, what event in the war inspired it. I do not agree with all her conclusions (she would put, for example, besides the passage already mentioned, the *Pentekontaetia*, the *Epitaphios*, and all or most of Pericles' last speech, after 404); but I cannot but express admiration for her analytical method. There are occasions, however, when she seems not to have freed herself sufficiently from old conceptions: i. 77. 6 must be late because it implies knowledge of the event of the war; why not argue that it must be early because it implies an ignorance of Brasidas' diplomatic success (iv. 81. 2)? The commonplace in ii. 64. 3, *πάντα γὰρ πέφυκε καὶ ἐλαττοῦσθαι*, could only have been written after 404; we can more plausibly argue that *μῖσος μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἀντέχει*, ii. 64. 5, must be early, for it was falsified by the event.

A weakness in the book is on the purely historical side. Mme de Romilly relies too much on Plutarch for an old-fashioned conception of Athenian political groups, with a wide divergence between moderate and extreme imperialists, and moderate and extreme democrats, continuing from the past throughout the period of the war. To explain Thucydides' silence she must, as others have done, imply an extreme degree of simplification of Athenian politics in him, which she argues is justified in a historian, but which would in fact amount to falsification; besides, Thucydides is not always silent—there are significant passages which imply no such divergence: ii. 65. 2, iv. 65. 4, vi. 24. And she finds herself compelled, in effect, to put Themistocles, Cimon, and Pericles in the same party of moderates, which is inconsistent in one who relies for history on Plutarch. It is, I feel, not

without significance that the names of Meritt and Wade-Gery are absent from a fairly full bibliography and their writings apparently (I refer only to those earlier than 1939; later ones were not available) almost entirely unknown. Nor is there any reference to Finley's articles in *Harvard Studies*.

There is one other feature of this book which I would criticize, and it is an important feature. Mme de Romilly, like so many others, makes Thucydides more of a philosopher and less of a historian than I would, and in consequence, I think, applies some arbitrary rule of what he *approved*: all of Pericles, none of Cleon, and *therefore* all of Diodotus and the Spartan speech, iv. 17-20, most of

Nicias and little of Alcibiades. This is not only to oversimplify: it misses most of the subtlety of Thucydides' observation and the objective character of his record.

But it would take an essay to justify this criticism, and, in spite of the importance of this aspect of the problem, I end by repeating my sense of the great intelligence shown in this book, the thoroughness of the analysis, the ability to discuss detail and never to lose sight of the whole. With this and Finley's book a new and already fruitful period in the study of Thucydides has begun.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

#### SOCRATES—HERO OF FICTION

Olof GIGON: *Sokrates, sein Bild in Dichtung und Geschichte*. Pp. 319. Berne: Francke, 1947. Cloth, 11.50 Sw. fr.

It is certainly rash to claim Aristotle's support for the belief that the Socratic logoi are a kind of poetry. It is still more rash to deduce that they contain no historical or biographical elements. The assumption that the literary genres are mutually exclusive appears in a most naïve form when it is used for proving that, before the emergence of biography as a separate form of art, there could be nothing of a biographical nature contained in the other kinds of literature. On this and on most other questions G. is inconsistent and confused; for if Aristotle, according to a fairly common view (which G. shares apparently, though, so far as I can judge from the imperfect copy sent for review, he does not mention it), got his information about Socrates from the dialogues of Plato, it is clear that he regarded them as not wholly fiction but as in some degree historical and biographical. G. completely ignores the question of the independent value of Aristotle on Socrates, and in particular of Aristotle's view of what Socrates did for philosophy; this is all the stranger in one who lays such stress on Aristotle's account of Socrates' wives (the first,

Xanthippe, and the second, Myrto), an account which certainly owes nothing to Plato!

According to G., Socrates, Alcibiades, and all the other figures in the dialogues of Plato and of the other Socratics are literary types, not individuals. They are treated as freely as Agamemnon or Orestes is treated by the tragedians. There are two main themes. Firstly, in Aeschines as in Plato, Socrates is the type of the *εἰρων*, opposed to the *ἀλάζων*, who is typified by the sophists. All the sophists in Plato seem suspiciously alike to G., even though, when he wrote this book, he was still of the opinion that Plato is the author of the *Protagoras* (cf. *C.R.* lxi. 59-60). The second main theme of the Socratic writings is the contrast between Socrates as a commoner (perhaps a stone-mason, but Burnet on *Euthyphro* 11 b might have added to G.'s scepticisms) and Alcibiades as an aristocrat. Under this head comes, for example, Xenophon, *Mem.* iii. 7: this passage has been lifted from someone's dialogue between Socrates and Alcibiades; X. merely changed the name to Charmides for defensive reasons. *Mem.* i. 6. 14, where Socrates is represented as 'working up extracts', is taken as proving, not that Socrates collected ethical scraps, but that Xenophon produced *Mem.* by combining

snippets from earlier Socratic writers, chiefly Antisthenes.

G. holds that Socrates made no defence before the court; but, since Plato is no longer evidence, his grounds are very unlike those of H. Gomperz (*Wiener Studien*, 1936, pp. 32-43), who based this view largely on *Gorg.* and *Theaet.* G. relies on the contradictions which he finds in the Socratic writings and the later collections of anecdotes, which are inconsistent with each other (and, in the case of Plato at least, with themselves) on practically everything concerning Socrates, his family, his philosophy, his defence, his 'divine sign', etc. For example, these authorities give no clear-cut answer to the question whether Socrates remained silent because he wished, or because he did not wish, for death; and whether he wished for death (if that was his attitude) because of the troubles of old age, or because of his belief in a better life beyond the grave. Their accounts of the matter are therefore fiction. G., it is clear, lives in an unreal world where all the ideas of men have Cartesian clarity, and their motives are never mixed. Because of these contradictions the problem of the life and teaching of the historic Socrates is to be abandoned as illegitimate. Socrates is just a hero of philosophic poetry, resembling other figures of literary anecdote, such as

Thales or Anacharsis or Simon the cobbler. Much of the book consists of speculations about the sophists, the Socratics, and their relations to one another and to poets and statesmen. It would be hard to say what evidential basis is left for these subjective constructions; and it is not surprising that they frequently degenerate into a series of questions with the constant refrain: '... wissen wir nicht'. As to Socrates himself, we are left, historically speaking, with only 'das Unbekannte, das Sokrates heisst'.

This negative result is due to G.'s picking and choosing what he likes among the evidence of all dates. Thus on the strength of a remark in D.L. ix. 53 he believes that Protagoras and not Plato was the inventor of the Socratic dialogue. But why ignore Epictetus on the writings of Socrates, not to mention the evidence that Plato wrote Socratic dialogues during the lifetime of Socrates? In such matters the analysis must be exhaustive, if it is not to be valueless. G. may be right at times in finding literary motives; for example, the proposal that Socrates should be publicly maintained may be related to Xenophanes fr. 2. But he cannot be right in assuming that they account for everything.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

### PLATO'S DOCTRINE OF THE GOOD

H. W. B. JOSEPH: *Knowledge and the Good in Plato's Republic*. Pp. 73. Oxford University Press, 1948. Cloth, 5s. net.

THIS excerpt from a course of lectures planned in 1925 is a welcome addition to the Oxford series of classical monographs. Mr. Joseph considered Plato's doctrine of the Good to be of great philosophical importance, but did not include this work among his published essays, presumably from lack of confidence in his exposition. It must be acknowledged that the work does not form a complete whole, and that the absence of any commentary on Plato's survey of the sciences in Book VII is a

serious deficiency. But readers will find here a judicious account of the doctrine and of the more important problems of interpretation, enlivened by apt, but never misleading or superfluous, comparisons between Plato and modern philosophers. The style is concise and direct. The editors apologize for its informality; but some readers may comment, *utinam sic omnia dixisset*.

Having explained how the Good is introduced into the argument as the μέγιστον μάθημα, and given a forward glance at the whole ensuing passage, the lecturer turns to the simile of the Sun. In the *Phaedo* Socrates had already shown that our demand for an



explanation of the element that is simply 'given' in natural, and also in mathematical, science can only be satisfied by a reference to purpose. The same truth is implied here; but Plato is now no longer concerned with the physical world and the cause of becoming; what has now to be shown is the pre-eminence of the Good among the intelligible Forms. Plato finds purpose, or something analogous thereto, even where there is no question of any process or temporal change. The statement that the Good is 'beyond being in dignity and power' is explained by Joseph as the result of true insight into the distinctive character of the predicate 'good'—goodness is no mere quality, but is the whole essence of the thing of which it is predicated. (He has developed this point elsewhere.) The Good is interpreted, not as the highest individual member in the system of Forms, but as the purposiveness, present throughout the system, which would be revealed if one could view them as a whole. (But this does not seem to allow sufficient force to the words *ἐπέκεινα τῆς οὐσίας*, etc., and an examination of the meaning of *οὐσία* is in any case required.)

There follows an excellent statement of the problems involved in 'the Line' and 'the Cave'; but readers of the *C.R.* will need no guide along this well-worn staircase. The lecturer proceeds to explain the reasoning which might have led Plato to assume special 'intermediate' objects for the mathematical sciences, concluding, without great confidence, that Plato, when he wrote the *Republic*, supposed the mathematician to be thinking about Ideas, and means us to understand that the objects of *διάνοια* and *νόησις* in the Line are the same.

In what sense is the dialectical method said to 'destroy' the hypotheses (of the sciences)? Joseph says that this might refer to the procedure of dialectic in the Aristotelian sense, i.e. reasoning which defends first principles against objection by showing the consequences of their denial. Dismissing, however, this promising suggestion, he

considers the view that Plato may have had in mind the derivation of Ideas and Numbers from their principles, with which he was concerned in his oral teaching. After some acute criticism he concludes that if this was Plato's intention he was wrong, since there is no common principle from which the *ἀρχαί* of the sciences can be deduced, and also Aristotle's objection that number must be presupposed in any attempt to state its derivation is sound. And there are more valuable elements than this in Plato's notion of dialectic.

At this point, diverging from the *Republic*, the lecturer explains the motives which may have led Plato to assume Ideas, and to regard them as separate from sensible objects. Once more he finds the key in the notion of plan or purpose. Plato hesitated to assume ideas of trivial things, though he knew that our judgements about them require universals, for the same reasons which have led other thinkers to doubt whether the divine plan extends to the details of the world. As to the separateness of the Ideas, it is a necessary consequence of believing that the soul can exist apart from the body, and it seems to be confirmed by the apparent possibility of intelligence without sense.

The last chapter deals with Plato's attempts to solve the problem of the relation of Forms to each other. No human mind can see the whole system of Forms, but Plato shows an interest in four distinct processes which indicate some 'earnest' of the mind's power to trace their interrelation. Logical *διαίρεσις* is one of these; the teleological explanation, which explains, by reference to the Good, *why* such-and-such species and genera are necessary to the world-plan, is another.

Readers will probably differ in their opinion of the synthesis of Plato's doctrine attempted in the last part of the argument. It seems to me as successful as any attempt can be, which fails to recognize in the *Republic* the conclusion to an earlier phase of Plato's thought, in many respects sharply contrasted with that which follows.

The treatment of certain details,



which do not affect the general argument, is questionable. I must mention that Socrates was not disappointed because he discovered the *Noûs* of Anaxagoras to be a subtle form of matter; this is, on the contrary, a dubious criticism propounded by modern scholars on the basis of a single phrase of Anaxagoras. The opening sentences of the *Philebus* are mistranslated and the opposing theses consequently mis-

construed: *Philebus* regards pleasure as the good for all animals, Socrates maintains that wisdom and thinking are the good for those beings (not those *men*) who are able to share in them.

It would have been helpful if the editors had added a bibliography showing where to find discussions of the same problems subsequent to 1925.

D. J. ALLAN.

University of Edinburgh.

### ARISTOTLE

Werner JAEGER: *Aristotle: Fundamentals of the History of his Development*. Translated with the author's corrections and additions by Richard Robinson. Pp. 475. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.

A GROWING neglect of the history of philosophy is partly the cause and partly the effect of the present anaemic condition of philosophic studies in Oxford. It is therefore refreshing to find that the Clarendon Press can still spare paper to republish Mr. Robinson's excellent translation of Werner Jaeger's *Aristoteles*. Since its first appearance in 1923 the general opinion of Aristotelian scholars, at least in this country, has swung somewhat against its more extreme conclusions, for example in attributing *Metaphysics A* to the latest period of Aristotle's thought; but the book is a classic, not merely because it presents a new critical method but also by virtue of its author's real ability to move in the Aristotelian system and think as Aristotle thought.

The new additions consist only of a few minor alterations and of a more complete index, but Mr. Robinson has published with it two important articles by Dr. Jaeger. The first, written in English for the *Philosophical Review*, 1940, epitomizes Jaeger's *Diokles von Karystos* (1938), in which he contends convincingly that this little-known physician was a pupil of Aristotle and

not an early-fourth-century figure. The second has a much wider bearing. It is Mr. Robinson's translation of an article (1928) on 'The Origin and Cycle of the Philosophic Ideal of Life'. It shows effectively how later Greek thinkers projected their own ideals upon the dim figures of the pre-Socratics. Plato uses the anecdote of the absent-minded Thales to exalt the life of contemplation. Aristotle, though he adds the complementary tale of how Thales made a corner in olive-presses, and though in his thinking *φρόνησις* and *σοφία* definitely bifurcate, yet on the whole sees the past through Platonic spectacles because he still accords the palm to *σοφία*. But the Peripatetic, Dicaearchus of Messene, found the essence of man in action, a view foreshadowed in the *Magna Moralia*, which Jaeger acutely analyses. So to Dicaearchus the pre-Socratic sages appear primarily as law-givers and men of practical understanding.

The article contributes considerably to scholarship, and provides an ironic comment on a book such as Dr. Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies*, in which the presentation of Plato is based on a highly emotional interpretation of the texts, and that of Aristotle on an apparently almost complete ignorance of them.

G. R. G. MURE.

Merton College, Oxford.

## PLUTARCH'S LIFE OF AGESILAUS

Isaac Bos: *Plutarchus' Leven van Agesilaus*. Inleiding, Tekst, Commentaar. Pp. xxx+227. Groningen: Wolters, 1947. Paper.

THIS edition, presented as a doctorate thesis in the University of Amsterdam, is a valuable addition to the recent Dutch researches on Plutarch's *Lives*. In the first part of his Introduction, Bos accepts in the main the views of Stolz (1929) on the position of the *Agesilaus* in the series. Turning to deal with Plutarch's sources for the *Agesilaus*, he is content first to present a list of those cited in the text, and then to summarize previous works on the subject, the most recent of which is that of Petrou (1888), and to signify his qualified agreement with the main conclusion of Meyer (1899), that Plutarch made use of 'intermediate sources' to avoid unnecessary research. He makes no reference, either here or elsewhere, to the many modern studies on the sources of Plutarch's Greek *Lives*—the work of Uxkull-Gyllenband, Porter, Westlake (whose *Pelopidas* article is very important for students of the *Agesilaus*), Powell, Smits, and Gomme. He overlooks the obvious connexion between the *Agesilaus* of Plutarch and that of Nepos, and while he states correctly that Callisthenes holds an important position among the sources, he makes no attempt to prove this, or to correct further Petrou's out-of-date ideas. His superficial treatment of this important subject is the weakest part of his book. In discussing the manuscripts, he follows the description of them by Lindskog (1906), and, rejecting the statement of Ziegler (1907), that the archetype of S and Y was not of an early date, argues plausibly that it may be placed as early as the second

century. In the fourth part of the Introduction he reconciles the scheme of the *Agesilaus* with the general plan given by Leo (1901), whose conclusions he regards as not convincingly refuted by Weizsäcker (1931).

The text is reprinted from that of Ziegler (1926), with the regrettable omission of a critical apparatus.

The commentary, which takes up 183 pages, contains full discussions on points of grammar and language, with references to Kühner-Blass, Kühner-Gerth, and other standard works. Textual questions are in the main discussed only where Bos disputes Ziegler's preferences. He is more conservative than Ziegler in accepting emendations and readings of inferior manuscripts, and where he disagrees with Ziegler he usually improves the text. He has, however, omitted to discuss a few passages where Ziegler's choice is questionable—18. 9, 26. 7, 27. 1, 29. 5. Apart from minor omissions, the notes on biography and general antiquities are adequate. In addition to discussions, often lengthy, on controversial historical subjects like the validity of Leotychidas' claim to the succession, the enmity between Agesilaus and Antalcidas, the instigation of Sphodrias' raid, and the chronology of Agesilaus' reign, there are summaries of those relevant events which Plutarch omits from his narrative. This scarcely compensates for the absence of an historical introduction, which could have presented a coherent picture of Agesilaus' career against the background of his times, and a useful corrective to Plutarch.

The book contains a four-page bibliography, and is well indexed.

P. B. DUFFIN.

Queen's University, Belfast.

## THREE TREATISES ON KINGSHIP

Louis DELATTE: *Les Traités de la Royauté d'Ecphanté, Diotogène et Sténidas*. (Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fasc. XCVII.) Pp. x+318. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et

Lettres (Paris: Droz), 1942. Paper, 100 fr.

In this volume of a little over 300 pages M. Louis Delatte, the son of Professor A. Delatte, has accomplished a useful piece of work. Very little is known of

the three philosophers here studied, Ecphantus, Diotogenes, and Sthenidas, apart from fragments preserved by Stobaeus, who quotes from their treatises *Upon Kingship*, and also from another work, *Upon Holiness*, by Diotogenes. In 1822 Thomas Taylor had published a translation of these passages together with those of 'other ancient Pythagoreans', but little notice was taken of them until the learning and ingenuity of Professor Erwin Goodenough of Yale rescued them from oblivion. In *Yale Classical Studies*, vol. i, 1928, he published a translation accompanied by a long and interesting study, in which he assigned these authors to the early Hellenistic Age, and suggested that their works had provided a theoretical basis for Hellenistic monarchy. His thesis won the acceptance of many scholars, and became more or less orthodox.

But now comes M. Delatte, who has submitted the dialect, syntax, and vocabulary of these fragments to a most penetrating and thorough analysis with very interesting results. The Doric dialect, he finds, is of late date and archaizing; the vocabulary suggests a date certainly subsequent to Polybius, and contemporary with Josephus and Plutarch, and even perhaps Lucian;<sup>1</sup> the writers' *clausulae* and their attitude towards hiatus demand a period ranging from the first century of the Christian era to the Second Sophistic. This established, Delatte proceeds to discuss notions about divine kingship, and examines elements deriving from Persia, from classical Greece—'les Grecs divinisèrent les hommes avec une facilité déconcertante'—from the Hellenistic Age, and from the Roman late republic and Empire; a final section studies what may be gathered about Pythagorean teaching on this topic.

There now follows, pp. 164–281, an elaborate commentary upon the thought of the fragments, which brings out how much Stoic theory there is underlying

them. Delatte's conclusion, lucidly set out on pp. 282–90, is highly attractive; the whole evidence, linguistic, grammatical, stylistic, coupled with the thought-content of the treatises themselves, converges strikingly upon the first century of our era as the date of composition, with a fair margin on either side; the treatises may be regarded as Pythagorean apocrypha. Their authors are attempting, under the Roman Empire, to find some form for a theory of the divine right of kings which could accord with 'Pythagorean' doctrines. For Diotogenes the king is God's lieutenant on earth, who imitates his master, and he lays considerable stress on the duties of a king: so long as the king imitates God, and his subjects imitate him, all will go well. Ecphantus, on the contrary, in more mystical vein, sees the king as mediator between God and men, and the king as working for the salvation of the world; only through the king can men perceive God.

In the world of that time the one inescapable reality was monarchy; how was that fact to be interpreted in the terms of the various philosophies? Different schools could put forward their theories, and the history of the second century suggests that the emperors themselves were not averse from offering a soteriology of their own. This judicious study by M. Delatte seems to me to be clearly argued and convincing,<sup>2</sup> and I think he has made an important contribution. But if the suggested date is correct, we are still left wondering to what section of the population these treatises, in their Doric, were addressed, or whom they were expected to influence.

M. P. CHARLESWORTH.

*St. John's College, Cambridge.*

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps greater caution should be exercised over the statistics of *hapax legomena* and new words in estimating date: none of the fragments is extensive, and word-formation is a tricky phenomenon to pronounce on dogmatically; 'there never existed anything like a complete record of the words which had been brought into usage. No author had on his desk anything like a modern dictionary, and accordingly, while there could be no doubt as to *verba inusitata*, there could be no certainty as to *verba nova*' (A. D. Nock, in *Coniectanea Neotestamentica*, xi, Lund, 1947, p. 164).

<sup>1</sup> In addition Delatte postulates an acquaintance also with Philo, but Prof. Nock points out to me that it is highly dubious whether pagan writers in the first two centuries read or used him at all.

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF PHILO

Harry Austryn WOLFSON: *Philo. Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. Vol. I: Pp. xvi+462. Vol. II: Pp. xiv+531. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1947. Cloth, 55s. net.

In these large volumes the Nathan Littauer Professor of Hebrew Literature and Philosophy in Harvard University has assembled a systematic presentation of the theology and philosophy of Philo which is a monument of industry, and is clearly the fruit of many years' careful reading and study. For the correct evaluation of the writer whom Reitzenstein called 'the most complex personality of antiquity' many qualities are desirable in the historian. Professor Wolfson makes the most substantial contribution to Philonic studies since I. Heinemann's *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (1932) and W. Völker's *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo* (1938). He writes with knowledge both of Rabbinic literature on the one hand, and of Plato and Aristotle on the other.

The main thesis is in strong opposition to the widely held view that Philo was not an original thinker, and that as a philosopher he was negligible. Indeed, for Professor Wolfson, Philo was 'a philosopher in the grand manner' who had 'the power of intellect to be able to reject the theories of other philosophers and to strike out a new and hitherto unknown path for himself. He is to be given credit for originality in all the problems dealt with by him, for in this particular set of problems he was the originator of every fundamental concept which continued to be discussed thereafter throughout the history of philosophy. . . . Without a group of official disciples his teachings became the most dominant influence in European philosophy for well-nigh seventeen centuries' (i, pp. 114-15).

Of Philo's influence on subsequent thought there can be no question. Above all he showed the Church how the Old Testament could be saved from

the not very tender care of Marcion and interpreted by philosophical allegory; by his influence on Origen and Augustine he moulded the form of Biblical exegesis. But it is a pity that the argument for his originality should be often overstated. Wolfson tends to assert his originality by ignoring later Hellenistic philosophy. With the debates between Carneades and the Stoics, and with the modified Stoicism of Posidonius and Panaetius, he never seriously reckons. Although, again, he is aware of Bousset's study of the school tradition lying behind Philo, at no point is any satisfactory account taken of the question of Philo's sources.

For instance, he is anxious to prove that the concept of God as nameless is not found in any other Greek philosopher before Philo, and dismisses as 'ill-founded' Geffcken's opinion that this was a Hellenistic commonplace, on the ground that the writers quoted by Geffcken (Ps.-Aristotle, *de Mundo*,<sup>1</sup> Dio Chrysostom, Seneca, Maximus of Tyre, Celsus, and the Hermetica) are all later than Philo, except Seneca who was his contemporary (ii, pp. 113-14). In any event, the argument that Philo was first with this notion shipwrecks upon the doxographic passage in Cicero, *de Nat. Deor.* i. 12. 30 (Diels, *Dox. Gr.* 537) quoting *Timaeus* 28 c: '... (Plato) qui in Timaeo patrem huius mundi nominari neget posse'. But what is more important is that Wolfson does not consider the possibility that both Philo and the other writers may be simply reproducing a commonplace of the school tradition. No doubt Philo had read for himself the more important dialogues of Plato. But much of his philosophy is that of the doxographic handbook, of the type characteristic of the eclectic Platonism which was taught after Antiochus of Ascalon by such men as Arius Didymus at Alexandria. It is a serious defect throughout Wolfson's study that

<sup>1</sup> For the possible influence of Hellenistic Judaism on the author of *de Mundo* cf. M. Pohlenz, 'Philon v. Alexandria', in *Nachr. d. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.* 1942, Heft 5, pp. 480-7.



he ignores Philo's dependence upon this kind of popular philosophy, in spite of the considerable recent literature on this subject.

Professor Wolfson has enthusiasm. He does not always convince us that he writes with equal care and discretion. For example, in various passages diligently assembled at i, pp. 363-6, Philo refers to the belief that the stars are living beings. In all but one passage Philo does not identify himself with this opinion; he merely quotes it as a philosophical opinion of which he neither approves nor disapproves. But in *de Gigantibus* 8 he says without qualification: καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι (ἀστέρες) ψυχὰς ὄναι δι' ὧν ἀκίρατοί τε καὶ θεῖαι. The passage is one in which Philo appears to be drawing on a commonplace tradition (cf. W. Bousset's remarks on this section in his *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria u. Rom*, 1915, pp. 15 ff., to which Wolfson does not refer). But on p. 366 Philo is credited with 'denial' of the existence of a soul in the celestial bodies.

Some of Wolfson's assertions seem over-confident. 'Certain it is', he writes (i, p. 242), that Philo's polemic against the view that the world of ideas is spatial is directed against Plato, *Phaedrus* 247 c (the super-celestial place). He likes to write 'undoubtedly' or 'quite evidently' (e.g. i, pp. 283, 383;

ii, p. 160), where the cautious reader who looks up the references will substitute 'possibly' or even 'just conceivably'. An opinion attributed to Clement of Alexandria in the text is supported in the footnote by a reference to Origen (i, p. 159). The argument from Origen, *de Princ.* ii. 3. 6 (i, p. 239) curiously ignores the fact that Origen did not write in Latin; we have only Rufinus' free translation at this point. For the Church Fathers in general it is a pity that references are not given to critical editions where they exist. Hippolytus' *Elenchos* should be cited from Wendland (i, p. 338, n. 39); and a mistake occurs at i, p. 157 through quoting Clement from the notoriously inadequate edition of Migne rather than from Stählin. But the author is not at home in patristics; the discussion of the Pelagian and Augustinian conceptions of grace (i, p. 459 f.) is very slight; and the well-known work of Prosper, *contra Collatorem*, is attributed to Augustine (p. 460, n. 9).

At i, p. 324, n. 9 read 37 for 33; ii, p. 242, n. 28 read 398 b; p. 273, line 22 'Sybarites'. Misprints also occur at i, p. 8, n. 18; p. 79, n. 87; p. 335, n. 22; p. 455, n. 94; ii, p. 115, n. 35; p. 158, n. 67; p. 166, n. 16; p. 289, n. 39; p. 419 last line.

H. CHADWICK.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

## PAPYRI

E. P. WEGENER: *Some Oxford Papyri—Plates*. (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, III B.) Pp. viii; 18 plates. Leiden: Brill, 1948. Paper.

A. H. R. E. PAAP: *De Herodoti reliquiis in papyris et membranis Aegyptiis servatis*. (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, IV.) Pp. 101. Leiden: Brill, 1948. Paper, 20 g.

REVIEWING Miss Wegener's *Some Oxford Papyri* (C.R. lx. 84), I mentioned the intention of the publishers to issue facsimiles separately. The first of the volumes noted above contains the promised plates, with a preface, in which the editor collects the principal suggestions for revised readings made by Mr.

Roberts and myself. She is quite justified in saying that her examination of the photographs convinces her that her publication of the texts was 'not premature at all'; a glance at the excellent plates will show how difficult her task was but how good a reader she has shown herself. It may be doubted whether later scholars will get from the plates, good as the photographer's work has been, much more than she; but this collection of facsimiles of documentary papyri, half of them dated or approximately datable, will be of great service to students of papyrology and for palaeographical reference.

It is thirty-three years since Viljoen

published his thesis on the papyrus fragments of Herodotus, and since then eleven further papyri, two of them of special importance, have been published. It was therefore justifiable to undertake the task again. Dr. Paap has performed it excellently, with thoroughness, scholarly accuracy, and critical acumen. I should personally have preferred to see the texts reproduced as edited, with only such accents, breathings, and marks of punctuation as the papyri themselves contain, but that is perhaps a matter of taste. In each case an account of the papyrus, its date and palaeographical peculiarities, is given, and the text is followed by a careful and elaborate commentary, written with some liveliness of tone and not destitute of humour. At the end is given a section 'De dialecto orthographiaque', in which the evidence of the papyri on such questions is summarized, and this is followed by a discussion of the relationship between the papyri and the later codices, with their two families, Florentine and Roman. Paap concludes (and it is a conclusion to which a study of the papyrus evidence for the text of almost any author leads) that the medieval families are of later origin than the papyrus period and that only an eclectic method, using all the available textual evidence, 'spretorum etiam "deteriorum"', is

justified. There are Greek and Latin indexes.

In his textual discussions Dr. Paap shows shrewdness and a robust common sense, refusing to impose on his author theories as to what Herodotus ought to have written. As he sensibly remarks (p. 100) 'non ea de re agitur, quid nos scripsissemus, si fuisset qui Herodotus fuit, sed quid noster scribere potuerit ideoque scripsisse sumendus sit'. Thus he deprecates attempts to establish a consistency of usage in dialectal forms and the like which it is unlikely that Herodotus practised. After all, he was not a modern seminar-trained philologist but an ancient Greek, a native of Halicarnassus, writing a literary and somewhat artificial Ionic, influenced by Homer in a narrative for which he rightly claimed an epical quality, and a man who had visited many Greek cities and lived for a time at Athens. It would be a miracle if his use of dialect forms were of a consistency to satisfy a modern scholar. Paap rightly insists that we must not force our theories, drawn from whatever evidence they may be, upon the text, but must judge each problem separately, using and rightly weighing the testimony alike of papyri, medieval codices, Ionic inscriptions, and ancient commentators.

H. I. BELL.

*Aberystwyth.*

#### VIRGIL'S LATIUM

Bertha TILLEY: *Vergil's Latium*. Pp. xv+123; 36 plates, 8 figs. Oxford: Blackwell, 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS book consists of a series of topographical studies of the coastal district of the Roman Campagna, the scene of the last six books of the *Aeneid*. It is based on investigations carried out in the years 1933 to 1939, and is illustrated by photographs taken by the author.

After an introductory chapter giving a general description of the Campagna Miss Tilly discusses in succession the scene of the Trojan landing; Ardea; Lavinium; the Numicus; Laurentum; Albunea; and Ficana and the Ager

Solonus. A part of Chapter IV, in which she restates the case for identifying the Numicus with the Rio Torto, and the substance of Chapter VI, in which the oracle of Albunea is identified tentatively with a cave, with sulphur spring, found by the author in the region of Zolforata, have already appeared as articles in the *Journal of Roman Studies*.

The chapter on Laurentum is of particular interest, for this city has of late had a precarious place on the Virgilian map. Miss Tilly's view is that there was an ancient settlement called Laurentum, but that its site was lost at an early date; the Laurentum of Virgil's time

was a cult centre to the south of Lavinium near the coast and the river Numicus, where he and his contemporaries thought they found traces of the ancient city. Miss Tilly quotes various Virgilian passages in support of her site. She does not quote *Aen.* xii. 43-5, where Latinus says to Turnus 'miserere parentis longaevi, quem nunc patria Ardea longe dividit'. This is surely inappropriate to a site only about two miles from Ardea, unless one accepts Carcopino's strange argument that the nearer the two towns the more effective Latinus' appeal is.

The chapter, useful though it is for its new approach to a vexed problem, is somewhat lacking in clarity and precision, nor is it always satisfactory in matters of detail. Dionysius' story of the brothers P. and M. Tarquinius (misleadingly called 'the two Tarquins') cannot be said, without further proof, to 'reflect a tradition coming from the fifth century B.C.' (p. 85). The discussion of the parallel passages Lydus *de Mensibus* i. 13 and D.H., *A.R.* i. 72. 3 (pp. 85-6) ignores the fact that Dionysius does not here refer to Laurentum at all. In connexion with Cato's reference to Laurentum preserved by Servius (pp. 86-7) mention should have been made of the argument of the sceptics that Servius is not necessarily quoting verbatim. It was not 'Cicero's friends' but Scipio and Laelius who gathered shells at Laurentum (p. 89). Aeneas did not send out the ambassadors to Latinus after tracing out the lines of his camp (p. 95).

In the chapter on the Trojan landing Miss Tilly is concerned to show that in making Aeneas land at the mouth of the Tiber and not, as tradition had it, on the Laurentian coast, Virgil's intention was to do honour to the town of Ostia. But to the reviewer it seems that Virgil deliberately thought away the busy commercial city of his day and substituted the picture of an 'unspoilt' river-mouth. If he wished to honour Ostia he has successfully concealed his purpose. The whole chapter suffers from a certain indecision. It may be, we are told, that Virgil in bringing the

Trojans to the mouth of the Tiber had in mind the projects of Julius Caesar and Augustus for the expansion of Ostia, in which case we have 'a good instance of Vergil's modernism' and 'the passage may be regarded as a plea for the betterment of existing conditions' (p. 28). But when she comes to examine the matter Miss Tilly is unable to find any real support for this view, and we are left uncertain whether she believes in Virgil's 'modernism' or not. Of the Ostian *area sacra*, with its shrine of Ceres, which she relates to the incident of the eating of the tables, she writes: 'That in the *area sacra*, and before those ancient shrines, one of them dedicated to the very goddess of the corn, a ceremony such as that of eating cakes of spelt was accustomed to be observed, and that at the sacramental feast tales were told of the Trojan landing, might be an attractive suggestion but without better evidence the mere suggestion would be indiscreet' (p. 28). This combination of boldness and timidity does not inspire much confidence in the reader.

A book like this inevitably raises the question of the relevance of topography to the poetry of Virgil. How much did the scenery and associations of Latium contribute to the latter part of the *Aeneid*? On this point Miss Tilly is a little disappointing. 'An epic poet', she writes in the introduction, 'writing of a well loved country and well loved scenes cannot have failed to reproduce that which must have been imprinted in the visual thought by inspiration and attraction' (p. xv). And again, in the chapter on Lavinium, 'Here in this ancient place, Vergil, whose pride was in the traditions of his people, would not fail to recognize one of the oldest memorials of the forefathers of the Latin race which a poet's instinct might inspire, where knowledge could not' (p. 65).

But in spite of certain weaknesses there is much of interest and value in this book, based as it is not only on a study of the historical and archaeological evidence, but on first-hand investigation of the sites described. Miss

Tilly has been not unsuccessful in presenting a picture of the Campagna, to quote from her preface, 'in all its tranquillity, seclusion and beauty of pre-war days', and has provided a companion to the last six books of the *Aeneid* which for many English readers

may well give a new interest to the reading of these books.

In conclusion it must be said that the lack of an index detracts considerably from the book's usefulness.

M. L. CLARKE.

University College, Bangor.

### THE DATE OF PETRONIUS

Enzo V. MARMORALE: *La Questione Petroniana*. Pp. 332. Bari: Laterza, 1948. Paper, L. 1,100.

IN 1937, when E. U. Paoli<sup>1</sup> sought to prove that the *Satiricon* was written in the third century, Dr. Marmorale played a leading part in the controversy which followed, defending the traditional date in his *Petronio nel suo tempo* (Naples, 1937). He has now recanted his erstwhile orthodoxy, and the object of the present volume is to demonstrate that Petronius wrote about the end of the second century, and at any rate after the accession of Commodus.

In the first three chapters most—but not all—of the traditional arguments for the attribution of the *Satiricon* to the reign of Nero are examined and shown to be inconclusive. That they are so, taken one by one, few would deny; but a multitude of inconclusive arguments pointing in the same direction may acquire a certain force in the absence of contrary proof. And Heinsius's interpretation of the outburst of Hermeros, 'Eques Romanus es? et ego regis filius. quare ergo servivisti? quia ipse me dedi in servitutem et malui civis Romanus esse quam tributarius' (57. 4) as an allusion to the claim of the imperial freedman Pallas to be of royal blood (Tac. *Ann.* xii. 53. 2-3) is passed over in silence, though some have held this alone to be sufficient evidence for the Neronian date.

In the long fourth and fifth chapters we come to M.'s positive arguments for his thesis. He finds in the linguistic usage of Petronius innumerable features which he regards as popular and late (he regularly identifies the two concepts), and hence (the argument is his)

impossible before the end of the second century, when 'la lingua letteraria s'è esaurita nella sua parabola'. Some of these, e.g. his explanation on p. 214 of *munus eccellente* (45. 4) as an example of 'la forma dell' antico nom.-acc. neutro', and his stigmatization on p. 219 of the double negative in 'ut nihil nec facere deceret nec dicere' as unclassical and anomalous, only betray the insufficient preparation for such studies which M. himself coyly avows on p. 136. Many of the rest are mere fortuitous similarities, e.g. Apul. *Met.* iii. 13 'abietus in lectulo meo' and Petr. 26. 6 'abietus in lectis', or not even similarities at all, e.g. Apul. *Met.* iii. 9 'cadavera illa iugulatorum hominum erant tres utres inflati' and Petr. 42. 4 'utres inflati ambulamus' (which harks back rather to Epicharmus' *αὔρα φύσις ἀνθρώπων ἄσχοι πεφυσσάμενοι*).<sup>2</sup>

But the unsatisfactory nature of M.'s procedure can best be seen if we examine a section of his book *in extenso*. On pp. 262-8 he lists points of resemblance between Petronius and Fronto, observing by way of preface that the grave consular would not imitate the idle trivialities of the *Satiricon*, and hence that in any borrowing he must be the creditor and not the debtor. He goes on thus: P. and F. both use the form *volpis*, and P.'s *maleiciorum* is paralleled by F.'s *eimagine*: both use the form *margaritum*—but so do Tacitus and Pliny: both use the construction *bene esse*—but, we may reply, so do

<sup>2</sup> Fr. 246 Kaibel: cf. also Sophron in *P.S.I.* II. 1214 fr. d 9 [τὶ δὲ] [αἰ]μας; ἄσχοι πεφυσσάμε[ν]οι. M. on p. 262 recognizes this, but says that he cannot imagine the freedman Seleucus quoting tags from Epicharmus or Sophron. Maybe: but we are dealing with Petronius, not with the characters whom he invents.

<sup>1</sup> *Stud. ital. di fil. class.* xiv (1937), 2-46.



Plautus, Terence, Cicero, and Sallust, to name only four: both use certain substantives in an unusual gender—but P.'s *balneus* is found in *C.I.L.* iv. 3878 (Pompeii), and his *caelus* in Ennius, Lucretius, and Vitruvius, while F.'s *exemplaris* is attested in Tac. *Hist.* iv. 25: both use *oro te* paratactically—as do Cicero, Livy, and Seneca, among others: both use the elliptical *frigida* (sc. *aqua*)—but in the company of Plautus, Celsus, Pliny, and Quintilian: both use the expressions *pote*, *faxo*, and *medius fidius*—sharing, however, the first with Terence, Varro, Lucretius, Catullus, Cicero, Propertius, Persius, and Martial, the second with Virgil, Ovid, Livy, and Seneca as well as the dramatists, the third with Cicero, Sallust, Pliny, Quintilian, etc.: both use the proverbial phrase in *tenebris micare cum aliquo*—of which Otto, *Spr.* s.v. 'micare' quotes examples from Cicero to Augustine—and the expression *terrae filius*—as does Cicero *Att.* i. 13. 4. These last two coincidences are characterized as 'veramente impressionanti'.

In the sixth chapter M. seeks to show that the *Satiricon* can have been written only in the period from Commodus to

Elagabalus, whose ethos it reflects and to events in which it makes frequent allusion. The 'allusions' are generally of the most far-fetched: e.g. Trimalchio owns *horti Pompeiani*, and also an estate which 'dicitur confine esse Tarraciniensibus et Tarentinis'; this is interpreted as a reference to Claudius Pompeianus, son-in-law of Marcus Aurelius, who retired to Tarracina (*Hist. Aug.*, Did. Jul. 8. 3). Finally, M. concludes that the *Satiricon* was written by one of the many Petronii prominent in Roman life under Marcus Aurelius and his successors.

The book fails to make its case. But it may none the less prove useful to the critical reader. There are many interesting observations, and the bibliographical information is useful. M. is, I think, the first to use the references to the gold ring in the *Satiricon* as evidence for its date, though he draws a perverse conclusion, as I seek to show elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> But what a pity the good grain is buried under so much chaff!

R. BROWNING.

University College, London.

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 12 ff.

### FISH IN LATIN

E. DE SAINT-DENIS: *Le vocabulaire des animaux marins en latin classique*. (Études et Commentaires, II.) Pp. xxxii + 122. Paris: Klincksieck, 1947. Paper, 300 fr.

A FISH-MARKET in the Mediterranean has an interest and an excitement of its own. It has no trout or salmon, no herring, no cod, no haddock, which last three make up the bulk of our whole fish-supply; but it has a great number of kinds, unfamiliar to our eyes, many of them beautiful, and none much more plentiful than another. It shows us many unfamiliar things, cuttlefish and octopus, shapeless ascidians (*vioulets*, *tetinotti*), heaps of purple sea-urchins; and if one ventures to taste an urchin, for example, one gains a new and memorable experience. When the scholar inquires the name of this or that, he is introduced to a not unfamiliar vocabu-

lary of what were household words to Athenaeus and his friends, to Horace, Plautus, Martial, Juvenal, and to the long list of forgotten scribes from whom Pliny drew his endless information. M. de St. Denis has given us a short and handy guide to this extensive and difficult vocabulary. He begins with an account of 'les poissons dans l'alimentation et la vie des Romains'; he finds no less than 260 names of fish and shellfish in Latin literature, eked out by Pliny and by the *Halieutica* which we ascribe to Ovid. He goes on to discuss this vocabulary and inquires into its various origins; and then proceeds to reduce the whole to a brief systematic lexicon. Both on the literary and the technical side of this task M. de St. Denis has shown himself to be well prepared by his early work on *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine* and other scholarly

works. So the student who would identify and distinguish (for example) *astacus* and *carabus*, *mullus* and *mugil*, or *loligo*, *sepia*, *octopus*, or is perplexed by such hard words as *acipenser* and *helops*, *lacerta* and *scomber*, *maena*, *smaris*, and *gerres*, and scores more, will find in this book a brief and useful guide. There is

plenty of uncertainty, plenty of room for difference of opinion; I do not see eye to eye with M. de St. Denis everywhere. But he has done what he set out to do, and his little book is a book for scholars.

D'ARCY W. THOMPSON.

University of St. Andrews.

### THERAMENES

Leendert VAN DER PLOEG: *Theramenes en zijn Tijd*. Pp. 278. Utrecht: Kemink, 1948. Paper.

THE elusive personality of Theramenes is here submitted to a painstaking and methodical scrutiny, in which the author discusses at length the problems relating to Theramenes himself, to the Revolution of the Four Hundred, and to the chronology of the period.

We must confine ourselves here to Dr. van der Ploeg's study of Theramenes, which is more than usually unsympathetic. His Theramenes is a confirmed oligarch, who cherished a 'back to Methuselah' ideal of pristine autarky for Athens and practised moderation only when more forthright methods were too risky, and a gangster ready for any foul play compatible with his personal safety.

This severe judgement rests ultimately on the author's assumption that the Athenian body politic was cleanly divided between democrats and oligarchs, so as to leave no room for a 'third party'. *Ergo*, Theramenes must have habitually collaborated with the thoroughgoing oligarchs, though he might wobble occasionally when the ship of state was rolling. Yet there is nothing to show that any Athenian party, however undemocratic, wished to reduce Athens to a mere county capital, and there is much evidence that a distinct centre party played a continuous and important part at Athens in and after Theramenes' lifetime. It is therefore not impossible that he was a man of the centre.

Furthermore, van der Ploeg is prone to rely on Lysias not only in passages where this advocate was bound to respect the facts, because the dicasteries

to which his pleadings were addressed would have readily detected any departure from them, but also in those where he could have risked false assertions or wrong motivations. He also ignores or discounts the value of the *argumentum ex silentio* as applied to Lysias. Yet Lysias, whose brief required him to paint Theramenes as black as possible, omits from his catalogue of crimes several charges made against him elsewhere. In such cases a verdict of *non liquet* seems called for.

To take a few samples:

1. Did Theramenes take a hand in the assassinations preceding the Revolution of the Four Hundred? Thucydides is equivocal and Lysias wholly reticent on this point. Should not Theramenes therefore receive the benefit of the doubt?

2. Did he open the campaign against the six generals after the battle of Arginusae? Van der Ploeg here disregards Xenophon's statement that the first measures against the generals were taken by the Boule, and that Theramenes' charge against them was made at a subsequent meeting of the Ecclesia. Theramenes may therefore have told the truth when he said, in reply to Critias, that he had turned on the generals in strict self-defence. Though the generals laid no blame on Theramenes in their dispatch from Arginusae, one or other of them may have incriminated him before the Boule. Lysias, who elsewhere emphasizes Theramenes' disloyalty, does not mention this affair.

3. Lysias may be right as against Xenophon in saying that after Aegospotami Theramenes went on embassy

to Sparta only; the 'long time' which he spent there may have been the interval during which the ephors convened and held the congress of their allies before a definite peace offer was made. Xenophon's story, that after various preliminary peace discussions at Athens Theramenes, on pretence of sounding Lysander, wasted over three months in his camp, is surely reduced *ad absurdum* by his statement that before this

chain of events παντελῶς ἤδη ὁ σίτος ἐπελεδοίμει! How could the Athenians have survived such a fasting marathon?

Some readers of this book may therefore prefer to judge Theramenes more leniently, or more sceptically. Even so, they will commend it as a careful, thorough, and well-argued piece of work.

M. CARY.

London.

### FESTSCHRIFT FOR EDOUARD TIÈCHE

*Festschrift für Edouard Tièche, ehemaligen Professor an der Universität Bern, zum 70. Geburtstag.* (Schriften der Literarischen Gesellschaft Bern, Heft 6.) Pp. xv+190. Bern: Lang, 1947. Paper.

THIS volume is full of interest for the student of the classics. The contributions include an account of Tièche's journeys in Greece in 1910 (O. Tschumi), and a description of a sixth-century cup, ornamented with griffins, which he then acquired (H. Bloesch). In a convincing article on δημοκρατία A. Debrunner shows that the word does not fall under any recognized type of word-formation: the adjective δημοκράτης does not exist, and, if it did exist, would give rise to an abstract of a different meaning (power over the people) from the actual meaning of δημοκρατία (a state where the people have the power). D. argues that μοναρχία (formed normally from μόναρχος) suggested the later formation ὀλιγαρχία which in turn gave rise to δημοκρατία (δημαρχία being ruled out for several reasons).

The inquiring schoolboy wonders why ἀγαθός does not have ἀγαθώτερος as its comparative. K. Jaberg finds the answer in a distinction between 'Elation' and 'Komparation'. The former is earlier, more 'affective', less intellectual, than comparison; and in certain categories of meaning its 'pre-grammatical freedom' tends to survive as an apparent intrusion into the grammatical scheme.

W. Wili compares Horace, *Odes* ii. 12 and Propertius ii. 1. He suggests that Horace knew, and 'as it were, answered',

the poem of Propertius, and that here we have the origin and the explanation of the aversion which these two members of Maecenas' circle felt for each other. The resemblances and contrasts between the two poems were well worth pointing out, and W. may be largely correct in his interpretation of their significance.

Much the longest article is that by W. Theiler on the 'poets' of the *Iliad*. Against Schadowaldt he champions the old belief that the poem is made up of strata. The creator of the *Iliad* could never, he thinks, have written passages like the eighth book which are marked by 'feebleness of style and of poetic invention'. In addition to the original Homer T. finds three poets of importance; the main work of the first was the *Mauerkampfs Gedicht*; that of the second the *Berückungsgedicht*, and that of the third the *Zeusdekretsgedicht*. He seeks to identify the work of these three by their characteristics of style and differences of interest; the second, for example, is said to be given to cosmic speculation, and to be fond of describing the swift movements of the gods. (Still later poets also took a hand in the work, adding the lay of Dolon, the recovery of Hector's body, etc.) The similarities on which these views are based are neither more nor less far-fetched than of yore. All this is admittedly *vieux jeu*; and the conclusion, far from novel, that the key to the whole process lies in the 'division and reintroduction' of the embassy, not to mention the stress laid throughout on the 'counsel of Zeus' (due, as van

Groningen has shown, to a fallacious view of the nature of the prelude, i. 5), might be held to imply a curious indifference to the arguments of newer schools of criticism. But both those who can, and those who cannot, believe that the *Iliad* was built in layers like successive Troys, will value this article for its learning and thoroughness—and perhaps most for the wel-

come admission, as 'incongruous' as anything in Homer, that all three poets, though guilty of weak imitations of the *Ur-Iliad*, have their moments of splendour, and do in fact command 'admiration' for rounding out the poem in such a way that it became ever more fully an 'expression of the early-Greek spirit'.

J. TATE.

University of Sheffield.

#### GERMAN HELLENISM

*Antike und Abendland.* Beiträge zum Verständnis der Griechen und Römer und ihres Nachlebens. Herausgegeben von Bruno SNELL. Band II. Pp. 220; 18 plates, 24 text-figs. Hamburg: von Schröder, 1947. Paper.

THE first volume of this publication, issued in February 1945, was probably the last book to be printed before supplies of material were cut off. Its contents were contributed to the 'Deutsch-Griechische Gesellschaft' of Hamburg. It had only limited circulation, and probably few copies have gone abroad at all. If it was as good as its successor, it deserves to be sought after and treasured as a link between before and after in German scholarship.

The handsome appearance of this volume deserves congratulation: paper, printing, and plates are excellent. The thought, which connects the very varied contents, is the dawn of Greek genius, and its specific contributions to later Hellenization. The first essay carries Greek inspiration forward into two modern literatures. The last, on Lucretius, anticipating the projected third volume, illustrates the impact of Greek physical philosophy on a Roman thinker, but also the abiding value of his meditations and questionings.

It is not possible here to give more than the briefest glimpse of the contents: K. H. Hansen (Hamburg) translates Tennyson's *Oenone* into German, in the same metre, with close fidelity and many fine turns of phrases, and a sympathetic introduction which stresses the significance of this and the other earlier poems as a link between the earlier and the later Romantic school,

and especially Tennyson's debt to Keats. Alfred Heuss (Kiel) makes some rather revolutionary suggestions as to the 'Archaic Period in Greece', especially on the significance of the Tyrannies and the Legislators. Kurt Latte (Göttingen) discusses the 'Idea of Justice in archaic Greece', from Hesiod to Solon, Pindar, and Aeschylus, and its gradual acceptance as the first function of the State. Fritz Krischen (Lübeck) traces the development of characteristic forms of Ionian architecture; capital, palmette, and the like. Emil Kunze (Munich) interprets as 'Zeus figures' the numerous bronze statuettes from Olympia commonly described as votaries, and connects them with maturer representations of the God. Ernst Langlotz (Bonn) defines the 'Essentials of representative art in Magna Graecia', with examples mainly from sculpture. Hans Diller (Kiel) connects 'Hesiod and the beginnings of Greek Philosophy', and Kurt Latte (Göttingen) uses Hesiod's 'Dedication to the Muses' to explain the relation between these deities and those they inspired. Manfred Hausmann (Worpswede) translates selected 'Early Greek Poems' with commentary. Bruno Snell (Hamburg) contrasts 'Pindar's Hymn to Zeus' with the Hesiodic *Theogony*, and traces principles of composition and relevance which cannot be fully appreciated in a modern text devoid of musical and choric accompaniment; other comparisons with Hesiod illustrate the development of the notion of divinity in archaic Greece; he ends with the contrast between Pindar's outlook and that of Attic



tragedy. Wolfgang Schmid (Cologne) contrasts the views of Lucretius as sceptic and as natural philosopher, and commends him for renewed study in a period like his own—*patriai tempore iniquo* (i. 41). It is here that the legacy of the old world to the new is most clearly expressed, in words which

awaken the deepest sympathy in classical scholars elsewhere.

When work of this quality and temper can be produced so efficiently, all is not lost in Germany. What have we to compare with it?

JOHN L. MYRES.

Oxford.

## SHORT REVIEWS

*The Odes of Pindar.* Translated by Richmond LATTIMORE. Pp. xii + 170. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1947. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE dust-cover of this verse translation of Pindar by the Associate Professor of Greek at Bryn Mawr College makes great claims when it says amongst other things that it 'recreates for the English-speaking world Pindar's magnificence of thought, loftiness of feeling, and boldness of imagination', and that 'readers will instantly feel the sure impact of Pindar's genius'.

To deal first with the versification, Mr. Lattimore's task is greatly simplified by the employment of 'free verse', which dispenses with rhyme and fixed metre and is, in fact, prose cut up into arbitrary lengths. Pindar's strophes and antistrophes are metrically identical, Mr. Lattimore's are not so; his metres, therefore, not only, as he says, 'do not exactly reproduce the Greek' but do not reproduce them at all, except accidentally, nor do they 'suggest Pindar's effects of tempo and stress'; in fact the only resemblance is that the odes are divided into stanzas like the original.

As regards the translation, the dust-cover seems to contradict itself when it says that 'this translation will recommend itself for its great scrupulousness and fidelity', and afterwards describes it as 'not meant to be literal'. It is certainly sometimes so literal as to be incomprehensible, e.g. (*Pyth.* viii. 8 ff.)

And you, when one fixes  
anger without pity fast in his heart,  
are stern to encounter  
the strength of the hateful ones, and sink  
pride in the bilge.

On the whole, however, the translation is accurate; whether it is poetry is a question which every reader must decide for himself.

The introduction gives an adequate account of what is known about Pindar and of the occasion and structure of the Pindaric ode. At the end there are notes on the date and circumstances attending each ode, and there is a useful index of proper names.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

H. R. BUTTS: *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama.* (Iowa Studies in Classical Philology, No. XI.) Pp. 247. Privately lithoprinted from

4598-28

typescript (copies obtainable from the author at 305 East Park St., Vandalia, Missouri), 1947. Paper, \$4.

IN this dissertation, prepared under the direction of the late Professor Flickinger, the writer has examined every passage in Attic drama which might seem to be aimed at the glorification of Athens. The material is arranged, for each dramatist, under various headings, e.g. 'myth and legend', 'complimentary epithets', 'choral odes', 'political references'. This arrangement has a certain disadvantage for the reader, who will find the same passage treated in several different places. B.'s defence would be that he regards the various types of praise as techniques originated by one author and developed by his successors. He says, for instance, of an Attic version of the Alcestis story: 'either Euripides had not heard of this myth or else he had not yet acquired the technique of preferring the Attic myth.'

The writer's enthusiasm for his subject tends to overwhelm his sense of proportion. Doubtless the dramatists were anxious to win the prize and were aware that praise of Athens, direct or indirect, might dispose the audience and the judges in their favour. It may not always be possible to say whether a particular passage is more the product of this motive or of patriotic emotion or of some specifically dramatic purpose. But B.'s thesis is surely reduced to absurdity when the second half of the *Eumenides* or the *Colonus* ode is described as 'chauvinistic' and regarded primarily as a 'hit' at the audience. It is not true that in the *Persae* 'the barbarous Persians are made despicable in every way'. It is most unlikely that the *Antigone* and *Electra* of Sophocles are warnings to his contemporaries against tyranny. B. frequently makes the point that it gratified Athenian pride to contemplate the shocking events which take place in Thebes or Argos, because 'such things could not happen in Athens'. Such a comparison is indeed invited by the dramatist, for fundamental reasons, in the *Oresteia*: in other cases the suggestion is far-fetched.

The collection of material is thorough and useful. The documentation is lavish—the bibliography contains nearly three hundred items. Is it unfair to suggest that the author has read too much about the plays and thought too little?

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM.

Westfield College, London.

Robert FLACELIÈRE: Plutarque, *Sur la Disparition des Oracles*. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon, 3<sup>e</sup> série, fasc. 14.) Pp. 269. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1947. Paper.

SINCE 1927, Flacelière has been engaged on the Pythian dialogues of Plutarch, and this book completes the series. Its general form is the same as that of its companions, the editions of the *De Pythiae oraculis* and *De E apud Delphos*; an introduction, a French translation facing the text, and notes critical and exegetical, the latter at the end of the book. In this case the introduction deals interestingly with the main problems of the work, its date (earlier, the editor plausibly holds, than the *De Pythiae oraculis*, see pp. 17, 50 ff., 100), its sources (Plutarch is credited, I think justly, with a wide first-hand knowledge of Greek philosophical literature), the persons of the dialogue, and the author's own rank as a philosopher, which is put higher than some would be disposed to allow, but perhaps not too high.

The text rests on a reconsideration of critical material already familiar, nothing new being offered in the way of manuscripts or *testimonia*; indeed, supposing any fresh evidence to exist, this is not a good time to look for it. Conjecture is used more freely than in the Teubner text (Paton-Pohlenz), especially to fill lacunae. The supplements are not always happy; for example, at 412A the editor adopts from Babbitt, and at 414A proposes on his own account, readings containing ugly hiatuses. New proposals are few and generally very slight; a good one is at 425A, where for  $\tau\omicron\upsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\alpha\rho \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , out of which it is hard to make satisfactory sense, the editor prints  $\tau\omicron \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\alpha\rho \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ , a very plausible restoration.

The commentary is the weakest part of the work. It consists almost entirely of explanatory notes based on the translation, legitimate enough as helps to readers who know little of classical antiquity, but riper scholars look vainly for discussions of the many difficulties of style, grammar, and phraseology which the dialogue contains.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Allen WIKGREN: *Hellenistic Greek Texts*. Pp. xxvi + 275. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1947. Cloth, 20s. net.

THIS book is a revised and enlarged successor to the *Hellenistic Greek Reader* already published. After a brief Introduction and Bibliography (pp. ix-xxvii) we come to the texts. There are sixteen extracts from the LXX, thirteen from the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and fifteen from the New Testament. Philo has two passages, Josephus six; and there are seven from early Christian writings. The papyri and inscriptions are represented by eleven extracts, while the religion and philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world are presented in selections from seventeen sources ranging from Xenophon and Theophrastus to the *Corpus Hermeticum*. The selection is a good one. It includes obvious choices like the Hymn of Cleanthes, and others less obvious but not less interesting to the student of religion. And it is clearly the stu-

dent of religion who is chiefly in mind in the preparation of the book. That being so, it seems rather a pity to give so much space to Biblical texts, which are readily available, and ought to be on the student's shelves in any case. The pages saved by omitting what can be found in Rahlfs and Nestle could have been used to give more extracts from writings outside the Bible.

The texts are taken from existing editions, and comparison in test passages shows that the transcription is carefully done. Suitable introductions are provided for extracts or groups of extracts; and there is a serviceable vocabulary. Here again the question arises whether the student, for whom this book is designed, should not be expected to have and use a Greek dictionary of his own. This is not just an academic question: sixty-five pages of vocabulary must add appreciably to the cost of the book; and it is to be feared that the cost will militate against its extensive use in this country.

On p. 28 the dates of Ecclesiasticus and 1 Maccabees appear to have been interchanged. The inscription of Abercius (pp. 136 f.) should surely have been printed as verse. The date given for it, A.D. 216, is really the date of the inscription of Alexander, which borrows from Abercius. The latter should probably be dated in the later years of the second century (Bardenheuer, *Gesch. Altchr. Lit.* i. 493).

T. W. MANSON.

University of Manchester.

A. J. FESTUGIÈRE: *Liberté et Civilisation chez les Grecs*. Pp. vi + 128. Paris: Revue des Jeunes, 1947. Paper, 80 fr.

THIS little book contains four essays: (1) on Greek liberty, (2) on civilization in the Greek city and in Christianity, (3) on *Romanitas* or *Latinitas*, distinguished from imperialism, and representing a human and a Christian ideal, and (4) the notions of *Autarcia* (Self-sufficiency) and *Community* in ancient Greece. Very simply written, with only a word or two of Greek, and with authorities fully translated, it is an admirable 'initiation' to moral and political thinking. The second essay, published in 1942, circulated widely in the French 'underground movement'. In all four, stress is laid on the process of hellenization, by which other peoples were initiated into the principles and habits of Greek life; and especially on the Roman reconciliation of political autonomy in cities and *municipia* with the all-embracing rule of law throughout the civilized world, Roman and Christian. A similar book in English would be of the greatest value—and not for 'young people' only.

J. L. MYRES.

Oxford.

Cl. BEUKERS: *Cicero's Godsdienstigheid*. (Historische Bibliotheek van Godsdienstwetenschappen.) Pp. xvi + 224. Brussels: N. V. Standaard-Boekhandel (Nijmegen: Dekker en Van de Vegt), 1942. Paper, fl. 5.60.

NOBODY who knows his Cicero would expect a study, however detailed, of his philosophical works, his

speeches, and his daily life, private and public, to produce a rapturously affirmative answer to the question whether Cicero was in any real sense a deeply religious man. It is, therefore, neither a surprise nor a disappointment to find that the result of the present investigation is largely negative. The method adopted is sufficiently comprehensive and the author remains faithful to his resolution to keep close to the Ciceronian texts. The first section of the book is devoted to a consideration of the *De Natura Deorum*, in which Cotta the Academician and Balbus the Stoic are seen as two sides of Cicero's own character; of the enthusiastic praise of philosophy in *De Leg.* i. 58-63 and *Tusc.* v. 5 ('o uitaie philosophia dux, o uirtutis indagatrix expultrixque uitiorum!'); and of divination. The second and largest section deals, among other things, with his relation to the Capitol, his view of Iuppiter, the significance of his placing of the statuette of Minerva in the temple of Iuppiter on the eve of his departure into exile, his concept of deity, and his use of religious language, e.g. in oaths, prayers, exclamations, etc. The third section shows the extent of Cicero's piety in family relationships, discusses his augurate, offers a few brief comments (possibly to be elaborated in a later study) on *ethiek*, on the consciousness of a purpose or mission in life, and on a future existence. It is a matter for regret that the quotations gathered together at the end of the volume should be disfigured by so many imported gross blunders of spelling and grammar, by stupid transpositions and careless omissions of words, and by other wilful crimes against the text of Cicero.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

G. F. DIERCKS: *Tertullianus De Oratione*. Critische uitgave met prolegomena, vertaling en philologisch-exegetisch-liturgische commentaar. Pp. civ + 312. Bussum, Holland: Brand, 1947. Paper, fl. 11.50.

TERTULLIAN'S *De Oratione* is not perhaps one of his more important works, nor does it display to the best advantage his characteristic precision of thought and directness of expression. It is a homily rather than a treatise, and there seems reason to think that what we have before us is not the finished discourse, but preacher's notes intended to be expanded at the time of delivery: this at least would account for the frequent *anacolutha* and obscurities of connexion. The first eight chapters are a somewhat superficial exposition of the Lord's Prayer, important as the earliest extant work of the kind, and frequently copied or paraphrased, often without acknowledgement, by later workers in the same field. The remainder of the work is a series of discussions of various questions of ceremonial and so forth connected with public and private prayer, a number of which are more fully treated in others of Tertullian's disciplinary works. The text is in a far from satisfactory state, a round dozen passages having so far resisted all attempts at satisfactory emendation.

Dr. Diercks's introduction, text, translation, and commentary are a model of what work of this

kind should be, and will from now on be a necessary part of the equipment not only of those who study this work in particular, but of all who are in any way interested in Tertullian's vocabulary, style, and habits of thought. The introduction and commentary between them discuss every subject with any conceivable bearing on Tertullian's work and its contents. The treatment of the author's vocabulary is illuminating in the extreme. The writer of this review, who has had a book on a kindred subject hanging about in the press for six years, can only be gratified in finding some of his own favourite suggestions anticipated here. In particular one would commend the attention Dr. Diercks pays to connecting particles, with results of much value to the interpretation of the text.

The text is printed with a full *apparatus criticus*. It can hardly be said that the editor has been successful in mending any of the desperate places—so much was not to be expected: but he has at least given all the available material on which others may exercise their skill. The translation (as far as the reviewer's knowledge of Dutch enables him to judge) is competent and clear. The editor has carefully read a number of other translations, two of them in English, and his criticisms of their inaccuracies (which are many) are undoubtedly justified. Indeed, one fact which leaps to the eye from a consideration of these pages is that for the benefit of British scholarship a new English translation is urgently needed.

E. EVANS.

Petrus P. HOONHOUT: *Het Latijn van Thomas van Celano, Biograaf van Sint Franciscus*. Pp. 262. Amsterdam: N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1947. Paper.

IN this book Dr. Hoonhout has given an able and comprehensive analysis of medieval latinity as it is found in this writer of the thirteenth century. A brief notice of Thomas and his work is followed by two chapters devoted to his style and vocabulary: in the former he examines literary influences, Seneca among non-Christian, Sulpicius Severus and Gregory the Great among Christian authors, also the Liturgy, with a brief reference to the particular *cursus* favoured by Thomas; in the latter some three or four hundred words are noted, mostly non-classical. The author, though of course familiar with the researches of Schrijnen and Mohrman, does not adopt at all systematically their phraseology of partial and integral, mediate and immediate 'Christianisms', in his notes on these words.

Far the greater part of the book is devoted to a thoroughgoing grammatical analysis; about 100 pages are given to the syntax of cases, prepositions, and pronouns, about 70 to that of the verb. The author is well acquainted with recent work on this subject, and his exposition of Late Latin syntax might well be found useful for the study of other writers besides Thomas of Celano. In a short conclusion he reviews the main influences exerted upon Thomas's style and language, among which is included that of the spoken Latin of his time.

Of this he says that for Thomas, as for clerics in general, Latin was a language of everyday speech, and to some extent still known to ordinary folk.

Two appendixes deal respectively with the relation of the *Life of St. Francis* to other biographies of the saint, and with the question whether Thomas is the author of the *Legenda Sanctae Clarae*. There is an index of the words noted in the section on vocabulary.

J. H. MOZLEY.

Queen Mary College, London.

Eleanor Shipley DUCKETT: *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars*. Pp. x+488. New York, The Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1947. Cloth, 25s. net.

'INTIMANDUM sane tuae sanctitati credidi quod movet quosdam quare in expositione Apocalypsis, ubi ad quatuor animalia ventum est, nova interpretatione Matthaeum in leone Marcum in homine designatum dixeris. Cum nonnulli contra. . . Rogoque in hoc opere plenius quid tibi de his verius videatur insinues.' The passage is from Bishop Acca's letter to Bede. Miss Duckett translates it thus: 'I think, too, that I ought to tell you that some people are worried because in that part of Revelation which deals with the four animals you gave a new interpretation—of Matthew as a lion and of Mark as a man. It has been the other way round. . . Would you tell in your work what you think on this question?' This example is quoted because the felicity of the renderings of Latin is the special merit of these biographies of Aldhelm, Wilfred, Bede, and Boniface. The author is at her best in summary and translation. She manages admirably such matters as the findings of the synod of Whitby, the *opera Bedae*, the letters of Pope Gregory to Boniface, or the rule of St. Benedict as it illustrates Bede's life as an oblate at Wearmouth. She is less happy when she has to describe the complicated politics of the sixth and seventh centuries. Hence, the life of Aldhelm, who did not move about much, and the life of Bede, passed almost entirely at Wearmouth and Jarrow, make better reading than the lives of Wilfred and Boniface. The book is meant for 'humbler students' and not for 'professors'. Eighteen pages of bibliography and numerous footnotes refer the reader to the original sources and the work of modern scholars. Unfortunately, Dr. Levison's notable Ford lectures, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century*, although delivered in 1943, were not printed until 1946, too late to be of use in the making of Miss Duckett's book.

N. R. KER.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

Samuel VON SZÁDECZKY-KARDOSS: *Übersiedlung und Verpflanzung von Bevölkerungen in der Geschichte der Griechen bis 362 v. Chr.* (Universitas Francisco-Josephina, Kolozsvár: Acta Philosophica, 2.) Pp. 39. Kolozsvár: University, 1942. Paper.

In this dissertation, which he has translated (with

additions) from his own Hungarian, the author discusses the transplantation or voluntary migration of whole communities in Greek history down to 362 B.C. The instances are first collected, then classified. So much is mainly non-controversial, though the footnotes do not suggest a secure control of the material. Only six pages are left for general inferences and they are disappointing. It is assumed that the phenomenon is peculiar to Greek history, deriving from the intensive political life of the Greek city state, centred in its citizens rather than its land. Transplantation was the natural policy for the conqueror in Greece. The point is worth investigation and could be developed, but the transplantations by Assyrians, Persians, Romans, Carthaginians, and others should be considered before conclusions are drawn.

R. MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

Hilda VAN DEN BERG: *Anonymus de obsidione toleranda*. Editio critica. Pp. 112. Leiden: Brill, 1947. Paper, 6 guilders.

NOTHING is known of the author of this tenth-century treatise, unedited till now since the *editio princeps* of 1693. The Greek is often ungrammatical, has no pretence to style, and is marred by numerous corruptions and lacunae. More than half consists of illustrations drawn without acknowledgement from Arrian, Polybius, and Josephus, some quoted more or less verbatim, others narrated in the author's own words. Much of the subject-matter is not particularly interesting (it compares unfavourably, for example, with that of Aeneas' *Polioretica*); but it contains references to several topics that recent years have made unpleasantly familiar, such as food rationing, evacuation of persons not contributing to the war effort, overtime work for munition workers, compulsory purchase of material required for defence, well-poisoning, and the activities of fifth-columnists (οὐδέποτε γὰρ ἅμα πάντες ὁμονήσουσι πρὸς προδοσίαν οἱ φύλακες, we are told reassuringly!). The present edition is the first to be founded on the oldest manuscripts, and future editors of Polybius will need to consult it for an accurate text of the fragments not preserved elsewhere. The text—an almost pedantically conservative one, which would have been easier to read if some obvious mistakes of author or copyist had been corrected, and if *iota subscriptum* had been printed as such—is supported by a full *apparatus criticus*. The introduction, in lucid if not always elegant Latin, discusses the manuscripts in great detail, the sources of the illustrations, and some of the author's most striking syntactical efforts. Some account of his vocabulary, and its relation to that of contemporary and earlier writers, would have been welcome. The notes at the foot of the text give copious quotations from other military writers and supply the meanings of some rare words. There are a few not very important misprints.

S. A. HANDFORD.

King's College, London.



Alexandre ALBENQUE: *Inventaire de l'Archéologie Gallo-Romaine du département de l'Aveyron*. Pp. 204. Rodez: Carrère, 1947. Paper, 390 fr.

THE Aveyron is one of the rather bleaker departments of the Massif Central, with limestone plateaux, the Causses, cut across in an east-west direction by the valleys of the Tarn, Aveyron, and Lot. To the Roman archaeologist it is first and foremost the department of La Graufesenque, the earliest Gaulish centre for the manufacture of Samian ware.

M. Albenque has successfully accomplished the great labour of compiling a most valuable inventory and bibliography of all the Gallo-Roman finds of known provenance in the department, thereby greatly amplifying the inventory in the *Forma Orbis Romani*. It has the additional merit of including a list of categories of objects located, so that any type of antiquity in which one happens to be interested can be traced without wading through the general list commune by commune.

A little extra space is given to the more important sites such as La Graufesenque (beside the town of Millau); the record of the discoveries on

such sites is summarized, and the need of further, more scientific excavation is urged. Pottery was not the only industry of the Aveyron. Several mines, lead and copper, which were worked in Roman times are known, and there was also a widespread industry for the preparation of resin.

An aqueduct 30 kilometres long served the town of Rodez (Segodunum); several handsome villas show that the region was not without its wealthy citizens; there are a number of well-attested Roman roads, of which the most important is the one coming up from Gallia Narbonensis across the uplands to Millau and Rodez. The exit of this road into the Provençal plain was watched by the prehistoric hill-fort of Cessero. Students of the pre-Roman and Republican periods will be interested to find various examples of black-glaze Campanian ware and of Iberian-type ware in the inventory.

M. Albenque apologizes for the small number of illustrations, due to lack of funds, but he has in fact treated us rather better in this respect than similar publications often do. For a good map of the department it is necessary to use the *Forma Orbis Romani*.

OLWEN BROGAN.

#### CORRECTION

In Mr. D. S. Colman's note on Euripides, *Bacchae* 836-8 (C.R. lxii. 107) Housman's proposal was wrongly printed. For ἀλλ' εὐμαθὴς εἰ συμβαλῶν βάκχαις μάχην read ἀλλ' εὐμαθὴς εἰ συμβαλῶν Βάκχαις μάχην.

## CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of 'The Classical Review'

Dear Sirs,

On page 107 of the last number of C.R.—vol. lxii, 1948—Mr. D. S. Colman conjectures εὖ ταῖων ἀρβύλαιων ἀρμόσας πόδα in Euripides, *Hippolytus* 1189. This was conjectured long ago by Hayley and is recorded by Wecklein in his edition published in 1900.

On page 114 Mr. R. A. Browne conjectures καταλέσας in Theophrastus, *Characters* iv. 10. This is read by Ussing in his edition published in 1868 and is recorded in the Teubner commentary (published in 1897) as a manuscript reading.

Yours faithfully  
G. B. A. FLETCHER.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

REVUE DE PHILOGIE

LXXIV. 2: 1948

E. Benveniste, *Notes de vocabulaire latin*: (1) justifies derivation of *industrius* from \*endo-struus by the original sense of *industria*, 'pursuit of a secret design'; (2) rejecting Cicero's account of *oraculum* (*Top.* 77) explains it as 'place where pleas are addressed to the gods'; (3) derives *signum* from \*sek<sup>no</sup>-nom, 'what is followed'; (4) justifies connexion of *vetus* and *fēros* by making *vetus* a metaphor from viticulture; *vinum vetus* is 'wine a year old', opposed to *vinum novum*. L. Lacroix, *Un nom de poisson énigmatique chez le médecin Xénocrate*:

λέπος in Xenocr. ap. Orib. ii. 58. 14 is a ghost-word; read θρίσσαι <αἱ> ἔαρος ἐκ πελάγους φεύγουσιν. A. Pelletier, *L'image du 'frelon' dans la République de Platon*: examines the interrelation of the metaphors from the beehive and from medicine in *Rep.* 552-73. A. J. Festugièrre writes a long review (31 pp.) of W. C. Greene's *Moirā*.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLIII. 3: JULY, 1948

R. E. Smith, *Lysander and the Spartan Empire*: re-examines the history of Sparta in the years 405-395 B.C. and questions the evidence for an

'overthrow' of Lysander in 403. A. R. Neumann, *Römische Rekrutenausbildung im Lichte der Disziplin*: discusses evidence for changes between Augustus and the time of Vegetius. H. W. Miller, *Euripides' Telephus and the Thesmophoriazusae of Aristophanes*: the structure of the first half of Thesm. closely followed that of *Telephus*. E. S. McCartney, *Notes on Reading and Praying Audibly*: miscellaneous examples, ancient and modern. J. A. O. Larsen, 'Foreign Judges' in Cicero, *ad Att.* vi. 1. 15: *peregrini iudices* are judges brought in from outside the State—a practice not uncommon in Hellenistic States; so the Rhodians provide judges for the Achaean League in Polyb. xxviii. 7. 9. C. H. Beeson, *Lupus of Ferrières and Hadoard*: L. had all the Ciceronian texts known to H. (except *Off.* and *Am.*) as well as others which H. had not.

## DIONISO

XI (N.S.) 2: APRIL, 1948

This fascicule is a tribute to the memory of Ettore Romagnoli on the tenth anniversary of his death. It contains, in addition to a list of the chief dates in his career and a bibliography of his publications, the following articles: L. A. Stella, *Ettore Romagnoli e la filologia*, an account of his views on the aim and methods of Greek scholarship and his contribution to it; most important is his work on comedy and lyric; C. del Grande, *Ettore Romagnoli studioso di musica greca e compositore*: R.'s musical settings for productions of Greek tragedies are more original than his studies of Greek musical theory; L. Massa Positano, *Ettore Romagnoli traduttore*, a critical study of his translations from Greek, among which the most successful are his versions of Aristophanes; V. Bonajuto, *Ettore Romagnoli rievocatore del teatro greco*, an account of productions of Greek plays, especially at Syracuse, directed by

R.; V. de Falco, *Ettore Romagnoli ellenista* (address delivered to the Istituto Nazionale del Dramma Antico), a valuation of his work as original writer, scholar, musician, and translator.

XI (N.S.) 3-4: JULY-OCTOBER, 1948.

M. Gigante, *Echi di vita politica delle 'Ecclesiastuse' di Aristofane*: Aristoph. *Eccl.* 71, 248 sqq. and 193-208 elucidated by reference to *Hell. Ox.* i. 3, ii. 1-2 and i. 2; in 195-6 the reference is to Epicrates. C. Ante, *Il teatro greco trapezoidale ad ali convergenti*: the theatre of Magnesia, studied in relation to similar buildings at Catania, Thasos, and Delphi, provides evidence that the trapezoidal plan was still usual in Greek theatres at the end of the fifth century. C. Corbato, *L' 'Anteo' di Agatone*: the name of Agathon's play with invented plot to which Aristotle, *Poet.* 1451<sup>b</sup>20 refers is 'Αἰθέρις'; its plot is preserved in Alexander Aetolus' *Ἀπόλλων*, and Parthenius' *Ἐρωτικά παθήματα*. F. Fochi, 'Il Maestro di Scuola', *Mimo* (III) di Eroda: a translation. C. Ferrari, *Il frammento del papiro berlinese 11771 e la trasformazione del coro da Aristofane a Menandro*: this fragment, probably of Alexis, is further evidence for occasional intervention in the action by the chorus of later Attic comedy; cf. especially Eubulus' *Ἐρεφανοτάλιδες*. G. Patroni, *Il Teatro Minoico e Mediterraneo precursore del Teatro Greco Classico*: Demodocus' story of Aphrodite and Ares, *Od.* θ 256 sqq., is an adaptation of a dramatic representation (probably by Homer himself) and makes possible the reconstruction of the conditions and methods of the Minoan theatre. G. L. Luzzatto, *Traduzioni tedesche di Sofocle: da Steinbrüchel a Hölderlin*: a critical study of the translations of J. J. Steinbrüchel (1759-1763), G. C. Tobler (1781), and Hölderlin. E. della Valle, 'I Contendenti di Menandro', *finale del V atto*: a verse translation.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Alfoldi* (A.) *The Conversion of Constantine and Pagan Rome*. Translated by H. Mattingly. Pp. vii+140. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Allamura* (A.) *Iacopo Sannazaro: De Partu Virginis*. Edizione critica. (Studi e Testi Umanistici, Serie IIa, Vol. 2.) Pp. xiv+75. Naples: Casella, 1948. Paper, L. 500.
- Ashmolean Museum*. *Guide to an Exhibition of Air-Photographs of Archaeological Sites*, November 1948 to February 1949. Pp. vii+19; 16 plates. Oxford: printed for the Visitors of the Museum, 1948. Paper, 2s. net.
- Bakalakis* (G.) 'Ελληνικά Τραπεζοφόρα. (University of Mississippi and Johns Hopkins Studies in Archaeology, No. 39.) Pp. 55; 4 plates, 15 figs. Salonica: privately printed, 1948. (To be obtained from Professor D. M. Robinson, University, Mississippi, at \$2.)
- Bakhuizen van den Brink* (J. N.) Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libri de Praescriptione Haereticorum, adversus Praxeum. Pp. 119. The Hague: Daamen, 1946. Cloth, fl. 4.50.
- Bakhuizen van den Brink* (J. N.) S. Caecilii Cypriani scripta quaedam. (Ad Donatum, de Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate, de Lapsis.) (Scriptores Christiani Primaevi, I.) Pp. 80. The Hague: Daamen, 1946. Cloth, fl. 3.50.
- Bardon* (H.) *Quinte-Curce: Histoires. Texte établi et traduit.* (Collection Budé.) Tome I (iii-vi): pp. xxii+212 (double). Tome II (vii-x): pp. 213-415 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1947, 1948. Paper.
- Baynes* (N. H.), *Moss* (H. St. L. B.), and others. *Byzantium: an Introduction to East Roman Civilization*. Pp. xxxi+436: 48 plates, 3 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Beasley* (J. D.) *Some Attic Vases in the Cyprus Museum*. Pp. 51; 8 plates. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 7s. 6d. net.

- Callista* (address of the Drama original writer, 1948).
- Callahan* (J. F.) *Four Views of Time in Ancient Philosophy*. Pp. xi+209. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Campbell* (J. J.) *Cicero: Pro Lege Manilia et Pro Archia*. Pp. xiv+xii+102+ix+60. Dublin: Browne and Nolan, 1948. Boards, 2s. 9d.
- Carrière* (J.) *Théognis: Poèmes Élégiques. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé)*. Pp. 138. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1948. Paper.
- Cary* (M.) *The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History*. Pp. viii+331; maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Colebourne* (R.) *Latin Sentence and Idiom. A Composition Course*. Pp. x+282. London: Methuen, 1948. Cloth, 5s. 6d.
- Courcelle* (P.) *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobie à Cassiodore. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 159.)* Pp. xvi+440. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Paper.
- Dale* (F.) *Latin for Today. Book Four*. Pp. xii+323; illust. 'London: Ginn, 1948. Cloth, 5s. 9d.
- Delatte* (A.) *La Constitution des États-Unis et les Pythagoriciens. (Collection d'Études Anciennes)*. Pp. 30. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1948. Paper.
- Den Boer* (W.) *Scriptorum paganorum i-iv saec. de Christianis testimonia. (Textus Minores, vol. II.)* Pp. 39. Leiden: Brill, 1948. Paper, 1.25 g.
- Elg* (A. G.) *Epistula Fausti Reiensis tertia*. Pp. 21. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1946. Paper.
- Elg* (A. G.) *In epistulam Fausti Reiensis tertiam adnotationes*. Pp. 23. Lund: Ohlsson, 1945. Paper.
- Essays in Political Theory presented to George H. Sabine*. Pp. viii+333. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 22s. net.
- Farrington* (B.) *Greek Science, its meaning to us. II: Theophrastus to Galen*. Pp. 181. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1949. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Fletcher* (F.) *Notes to the Agamemnon of Aeschylus*. Pp. 79. Oxford: Blackwell, 1949. Paper, 4s. 6d. net.
- Forster* (L.) *Conrad Celtis (1459-1508): Selections edited with translation and commentary*. Pp. xii+123; 4 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Grierson* (H. J. C.) *Verse Translation with special reference to Translation from Latin. (English Association: Presidential Address, 1948.)* Pp. 26. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 2s. net.
- Gries* (K.) *Constancy in Livy's Latinity*. Pp. 176. New York: privately printed, 1949. (Obtainable from the author at Queen's College, Flushing, N.Y.)
- Haarhoff* (T. J.) *The Stranger at the Gate. Aspects of exclusiveness and cooperation in ancient Greece and Rome*. Pp. ix+354. Oxford: Blackwell, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Hammerich* (L. L.) *Laryngeal before Sonant. (Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selskab, Hist.-Filologiske Medd., xxxi. 3.)* Pp. 90. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1948. Paper, kr. 12.
- Heath* (Sir T.) *Mathematics in Aristotle*. Pp. xiv+291. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Hill* (P. V.) *'Barbarous Radiates.' Imitations of Third-Century Roman Coins. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 112.)* Pp. 44; 4 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1949. Paper.
- Hönn* (K.) *Solon Staatsmann und Weiser*. Pp. 244; 24 plates. Vienna: Seidel, 1948. Cloth, \$3.50.
- Howald* (E.) *Die Kultur der Antike*. Pp. 272. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1948. Boards, 11.80 Sw. fr.
- Jacob* (H.) *On Language Making*. Pp. 16. London: Dennis Dobson, Ltd., 1948. Paper, 1s. net.
- Janáček* (K.) *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus. (Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Vol. 4.)* Pp. 64. Olomouc, Czechoslovakia: University. Paper, 7s.
- Jones* (A. H. M.) *Constantine and the Conversion of Europe*. Pp. xiv+271; 2 maps on endpapers. London: English Universities Press, 1949. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Keller* (R. M.) *Iste Deiktikon in the Early Roman Dramatists*. Pp. 46. Lancaster, Pa.: privately printed, 1946. Paper.
- Kerényi* (K.) *Niobe. Neue Studien über antike Religion und Humanität*. Pp. 264. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1948. Cloth, 19.50 Sw. fr.
- Kosmopoulos* (L. W.) *The Prehistoric Inhabitation of Corinth. Vol. I*. Pp. xxii+73; 51 figs., 4 plates. Munich: München Verlag, 1948. Paper.
- Κυριακαὶ Σπουδαὶ. Δελτίον τῆς Ἐραπειᾶς Κυριακῶν Σπουδῶν. Τόμος Ε' (1941): pp. 132; 1 plate. Τόμος Ζ' (1943): pp. 140; 4 plates. Nicosia: 1945. Paper, 12s. each.*
- Lane* (A.) *Greek Pottery*. Pp. xv+62; 100 plates (4 in colour). London: Faber, 1948. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Lejeune* (A.) *Euclide et Ptolémée. Deux stades de l'optique géométrique grecque. (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3<sup>e</sup> série, 31<sup>e</sup> fascicule.)* Pp. 196. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1948. Paper, 220 B. fr.
- Léonard* (J.) *Le Bonheur chez Aristote. (Académie Royale de Belgique, Mémoires, Classe des Lettres, Tome XLIV, fasc. 1.)* Pp. iv+224. Brussels: Académie Royale, 1948. Paper, 80 B. fr.
- Lesky* (A.) *Thalatta. Der Weg der Griechen zum Meer*. Pp. 341; 16 plates. Vienna: Rohrer, 1948. Half cloth, \$5.70.
- Lord* (L. E.) *A History of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1882-1942*. Pp. xiv+417; 49 plates, 2 plans. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (for the School), 1947. Cloth, \$5.
- Lucas* (F. L.) *Aphrodite. The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and the Pervigilium Veneris translated into English*. Pp. vii+51. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 6s. 6d. net.

- MacKay* (L. A.) *The Wrath of Homer*. Pp. ix+131. Toronto: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1948. Cloth, 14s. net.
- Martin* (V.) *La vie internationale dans la Grèce des cités (vi<sup>e</sup>-iv<sup>e</sup> s. av. J.-C.)*. (Publications de l'Institut Universitaire de Hautes Études Internationales, No. 21.) Pp. xiii+630. Geneva: Georg, 1940. Paper.
- Martínez Santa-Olalla* (J.) *Esquema Paleontológico de la Península Hispánica*. 2a edición. Pp. 156; 64 plates. Madrid: Seminario de Historia Primitiva del Hombre (Serrano, 41), 1946. Paper.
- Meyer* (E.) *Römischer Staat und Staatsgedanke*. Pp. 467. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1948. Boards, 15 Sw. fr.
- Milne* (J. G.)  *Finds of Greek Coins in the British Isles*. Pp. 47; 3 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 5s. net.
- Mugler* (C.) *Platon et la recherche mathématique de son époque*. Pp. 427. Strasbourg: Hirtz, 1948. Paper, fr. 2000.
- Murray* (G.) *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus*. Translated into English rhyming verse with Introduction and Notes. Pp. 131. London: Allen & Unwin, 1948. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Nougaret* (L.) *Traité de métrique latine classique*. Pp. xii+134. Paris: Klincksieck, 1948. Paper.
- Opuscula Archaeologica*. Vol. V. Edidit Institutum Romanum Regni Sueciae. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, XIII.) Pp. 156; 53 plates, 11 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1948. Paper, kr. 50.
- Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Edited by M. Cary, J. D. Denniston, J. Wight Duff, A. D. Nock, W. D. Ross, H. H. Scullard. Pp. xx+971. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 50s. net.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part XIX. Edited with translation and notes by E. Lobel, E. P. Wegener, C. H. Roberts, and H. I. Bell. Pp. xv+180; 13 plates. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1948. Cloth and boards, £2. 10s.
- Picard* (G. C.) *Castellum Dimmidi*. (Gouvernement Général de l'Algérie, Direction des Antiquités, Missions Archéologiques.) Pp. 229; 19 plates, 16 figs., 2 plans. Paris: de Boccard, 1947. Paper.
- Pieters* (J. T. M. F.) *Cratinus. Bijdrage tot de Geschiedenis der vroeg-attische Comedie. Suivi d'un abrégé en français*. Pp. xii+222. Leiden: Brill, 1946. Paper, fl. 6.
- Raven* (J. E.) *Pythagoreans and Eleatics*. Pp. viii+196. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Regenos* (G. W.) *Rafael Landívar's Rusticatio Mexicana (Mexican Country Scenes)*. The Latin text with an introduction and an English prose translation. (Middle American Research Institute, Philological and Documentary Studies, Vol. I, No. 5.) Pp. 157-312. New Orleans: Tulane University of Louisiana, 1948.
- Robinson* (D. M.) *America in Greece: a Traditional Policy*. Pp. 195. New York: Anatolia Press, 1948. Cloth, \$3.50.
- Rodenwaldt* (G.) *Köpfe von den Südmetopen des Parthenon*. (Abh. der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1945/46, No. 7.) Pp. 24; 24 plates. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1948. Paper.
- Ryba* (B.) *Magistri Iohannis Hus Quodlibet. Disputationis de Quolibet Prage in Facultate Artium mense Ianuario anni 1411 habitae Enchiridion*. Pp. xxx+236. Prague: 'Orbis', 1948. Paper, k. 130.
- Selton* (K. M.) *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311-1388*. Pp. xv+323; 8 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Mediaeval Academy of America, 1948. Cloth, \$7.50 post free.
- Severyns* (A.) *Homère—L'Artiste*. Pp. 200. Brussels: Office de Publicité, 1948. Paper, 70 B. fr.
- Simon* (M.) *Verus Israel. Étude sur les relations entre Chrétiens et Juifs dans l'Empire romain (135-425)*. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 166.) Pp. 475. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Paper.
- Sizoo* (A.) *S. Aureli Augustini Libri de Fide Spe Caritate, sive Enchiridion, de Catechizandis Rudibus*. (Scriptores Christiani Primaevi, III.) Pp. 175. The Hague: Daamen, 1947. Cloth, fl. 6.50.
- Slavia Occidentalis*. Tom. 18 (1939-1947). Pp. 585. Poznań: University, 1948. Paper.
- Souter* (A.) *A Glossary of Later Latin to A.D. 600*. Pp. xxxii+454. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Swedenberg* (T. and E.) *George Stepney's Translation of the Eighth Satire of Juvenal*. Pp. 68. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1948. Paper, 10s. 6d. net.
- Thomson* (J. O.) *History of Ancient Geography*. Pp. xi+427; 2 plates, 66 figs. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. Cloth, 42s. net.
- Tod* (M. N.) *An Address presented to Marcus Niebuhr Tod on his Seventieth Birthday with a Bibliography of his Writings*. Pp. 24. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948. Paper, 5s. net.
- Treble* (H. A.) *A Classical and Biblical Reference Book*. Pp. 191; ill. London: Murray, 1948. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Turyn* (A.) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Pp. xvi+402. Cracow: Polish Academy of Letters and Sciences, 1948. Paper.
- Weinreich* (O.) *Römische Satiren. Eingeleitet und zum grössten Teil neu übertragen*. (Bibliothek der alten Welt.) Pp. civ+431; 7 plates. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth, 16.80 Sw. fr.
- Wycherley* (R. E.) *How the Greeks built Cities*. Pp. xxi+228; 16 plates, 52 figs. London: Macmillan, 1949. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.



ditional  
Press,

en des  
nie der  
Klasse,  
Berlin:

. Dis-  
cultate  
ne En-  
, 1948.

athens,  
bridge,  
1948.

Brus-  
B. fr.  
lations  
romain  
nçaises  
p. 475.

de Spe  
zandis  
(, III.)  
Cloth,

p. 585.

D. 600,  
, 1949.

Trans-  
p. 68.  
f Cali-  
versity

raphy.  
bridge:

Marcus  
with a  
xford:

erence  
1948.

s. Pp.  
Letters

et und  
iothek  
ürich:

r.  
Cities.  
: Mac-